

Government of India
Ministry of Railways



Proceedings
of
PCE's Seminar
16th and 17th December, 2016



Indian Railways Institute of Civil Engineering
Pune

Proceedings of PCEs Seminar
held at IRICEN on
16th and 17th December 2016

Present –

Railway Board

- | | | |
|----|--------------------|------------|
| 1. | Shri Alok Ranjan | AM/CE |
| 2. | Shri S.K. Pandey | ED/CE(P) |
| 3. | Shri A. K. Dubey | ED/CE(G) |
| 4. | Shri B. P. Awasthi | ED/TK(P) |
| 5. | Shri A.K. Singhal | ED/CE(B&S) |

Zonal Railways

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-----------|
| 1. | S. K. Kulshrestha | PCE/CR |
| 2. | H. K. Singh | PCE/ECR |
| 3. | D. R. Shyamsunder | PCE/ECOR |
| 4. | Sudhir Agrawal | CBE/NCR |
| 5. | P. D. Sharma | PCE/NER |
| 6. | V. K. Madhukar | CE/TP/NFR |
| 7. | K. C. Saini | CE/G/NR |
| 8. | S. S. Gupta | PCE/NWR |
| 9. | S. N. Singh | PCE/SCR |
| 10. | J. K. Verma | PCE/SECR |
| 11. | Vishwesh Chaubey | PCE/SER |
| 12. | K. K. Sharma | PCE/SR |
| 13. | K. S. Kalra | PCE/SWR |
| 14. | Naveen Chopra | PCE/WCR |
| 15. | K. C. Swami | CBE/WR |

Shri N. C. Sharda, Director/IRICEN welcome AM/CE/Railway Board and all participants for the PCE's seminar in serene surroundings of new IRICEN building. He mentioned that a large number of agenda items have been sent by zonal railways. He hoped that during deliberation meaningful discussion would happen to arrive at appropriate recommendation for submission to Railway Board.

Shri A. K. Mittal, Member Engineering attended the seminar on second day and addressed the participants. During his address he stressed on safety and expressed concerned on disturbing trend on derailment on account of permanent way especially in yards at slower speeds. He advised PCEs to monitor Unimat working for timely attention, screening of ballast on turnouts, replacement of worn/over-aged components, procurement of fittings and fittings for turnouts, reconditioning of crossings. He also emphasised on following important issues-

- The need to review speed restrictions on platform lines and deep screening of PF lines.
- Anti corrosive painting at corrosion prone locations. effectiveness of painting underside of rail foot.
- Rail/weld failure and focused USFD testing.
- Oiling and greasing of joints, gap survey, creep.
- Liner biting of rails.
- Timely de-stressing of rails.
- Replacement of SEJs on age cum condition basis. Elimination of older design of SEJs.
- Stretches overdue tamping.
- Proper record keeping of rail/weld failures and defects.
- Patrolling in two shifts to detect fractures especially in vulnerable sections.
- Progress/booking of expenditure of track renewal works.
- Quality control at CSPs, including mix design.
- Sequencing of deep screening and relaying and improvement in track geometry during execution of these works.
- Mismatch in deep screening and ballast supplies.
- Elimination of bridge timbers with steel channel sleepers. Replacement of corroded channel sleepers. Replacement of smaller span steel bridges with PSC slabs.
- Elimination of wooden layouts.
- Elimination of unmanned level-crossings and construction of ROB/RUB.
- Progress of Bridge rehabilitation work; and progress at bridge workshops.

He informed PCEs that a proposal for empowerment of PCEs for re-appropriation of funds across PUs for Pay and allowances and 27, 28 and 32 is also being pursued at Railway Board. Placement of necessary checks and balances also would be required for increased level of out-sourcing. He also mentioned that with the procurement of high horse power locos having increased tractive force; certain precautionary measures would be necessary to ensure safety especially on bridges.

Shri Alok Ranjan, AM/CE, Railway Board, emphasised that safety is the foremost item as far as maintenance of assets is concerned for any engineer. In view of disturbing trend of accidents on engineering account, there is need to improve the maintenance standard and adoption of good practices and to ensure that manual provision are complied with by field staff. He further emphasised that-

- The inspections should be purposeful to notice deficiencies & corrective action taken.
- For track renewal works, progress needs to be improved further.
- Winter precautions and cold weather petrol ensured and monitored by inspections.
- Timely replacement of switches and crossings on age/condition basis.
- Procurement of thick web-switches.
- Action plan for washable apron with PSR.
- Track overdue tamping/deep-screening and strategy to clear backlog.
- Creation of track maintainer posts by surrender of khalasi posts.

Shri S.K. Pandey, ED/CE(P), reiterated issues concerning safety as already mentioned by AM/CE. He mentioned that Member Engineering has reviewed the safety performance and certain concerns were identified and communicated to zonal railways. He flagged the following issues, amongst others.

- Procurement of vital P.Way materials, replacement of wooden special layouts, repair to washable aprons, utilization of track machines and elimination of unmanned level crossings.
- The locations, particularly station yards (especially turnouts and turn-in curves), detectable rail/weld defect/fractures, liner biting etc., are cause for concern.
- Recently a reference has been made to GMs, for weekly review and feedback, about provision of maintenance block of 3 hours, weigh bridges, to ensure that WILD is functional and deployment of reliable rail defect mechanism.
- The JPO regarding running of CC+6+2 and CC+8+2 should be strictly followed in field specially to prohibit movement of un-weighed rake, imposition of speed restrictions, follow-up of WILD alarms.
- Regarding IOH/POH of tracks, it got in-principle approval of traffic directorate and a pilot project, in sections to be identified by zonal railways.
- Planned efforts to be taken to eliminate overdue tamping and overdue deep screening stretches.

Shri B. P. Awasthi, ED/TK(P), mentioned that

- For improving quality of welding of rails necessary guidelines and instructions have been issued regarding use of single shot crucible and auto tapping thimble.
- Availability of equipment and proper gadgets at welding site needs to be ensured at all welding sites.
- For flash butt welding QAP and laid down welding parameters are to be followed to ensure quality work.
- For IMR defects and USFD, necessary information is available for monitoring and plan for further actions.
- Efforts are being taken for inclusion of B scan into the system and carry out vehicular USFD. In addition two more vehicular USFD testing cars are proposed for inclusion in RSP.
- SAIL has augmented rail rolling capacity and in-line testing of rails.

- For procurement of WCMS, tenders have been invited and railways should identify locations for laying.
- For in-situ reconditioning of CMS crossing only robotic welding should be done through RDSO approved agencies.
- The procurement of thick web switches with supplier's rails has been de-centralized and necessary guidelines and testing regime has been circulated by RDSO.

ED/TK(P) also circulated a copy of a presentation indicating IT initiatives of civil engineering department and currently running applications, which has been appreciated at highest level. He also elaborated on further action plan for expansion of IT environment to cover few more areas and solicited suggestions regarding improvement of existing applications. For GPS survey and GIS mapping, zonal railways should give progress regularly. For aerial videography of IR network and project monitoring using drones, instructions and protocol have been issued. In case of any difficulty, zonal railways may seek assistance from Railway Board.

EDCE(P) made a presentation on IOH and POH of track and briefed about the proposed model, which has been deliberated in TSC and further worked upon. It has been decided by Railway Board that a pilot project should be undertaken considering critical activities to gain experience and establish new system. Further in depth discussions were held on the various challenges to be addressed for ensuring safety and proper maintenance of assets. It was also emphasised for implementation of speed certificates of RDSO and JPOs issued at Railway Board level should be done in right earnest. If required, speed certificates/JSCs may also be re-visited considering ground realities in respect of conformity to track structure and adherence to the provisions including WILD alarm monitoring and follow action.

Shri A.K. Singhal, ED/CE(B&S), mentioned that bridge rehabilitation works progress is not commensurate with the proportionate targets in terms of financial progress. The production of bridge workshops as well as elimination of unmanned level crossings is also falling short of proportionate target for some of the zonal railways. He also requested zonal railways to expedite works so that the targets set for the year are comfortably achieved. He urged SER and ER for early elimination of unmanned LCs in suburban sections.

During the course of discussions on non-agenda item regarding rail corrosion, which is an important issue, it was decided to constitute a committee consisting of PCEs of NWR, SER and EDTK(P) to study the issue and suggest remedial measures for improvement.

Minutes of discussions Agenda Items

1. Track - Standards, Policy, and Maintenance	
<p>1.1</p> <p>SER</p> <p>CR</p>	<p><u>Stipulating characteristics for New Works (New lines, Doubling/Tripling):</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Stipulation of track geometry in new projects to cater for future requirements of higher speeds (for curve designs etc.) in mixed traffic conditions (use of flat curves).</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>SER mentioned that in mixed traffic conditions, to increase the speed from 110 to 130 Km/h, as envisaged by mobility directorate of Railway Board, with existing maximum limit of cant and cant deficiency, the maximum degree of curvature works out to 2° i.e. (radius = 875 m). Similarly, for raising speed to 160 Km/h the maximum degree of curvature works out to 1.3° (R = 1330 m). However, from cant excess consideration, the minimum speed of goods stock works out to 75 Km/h (for maximum permissible speed of 130 Km/h) and 95 Km/h (for 160 Km/h maximum permissible speed) with limiting curvature of 2° and 1.3° respectively.</p> <p>In this scenario, the freight stock would constantly run with cant excess of 75 mm leading to greater pressure on inner rail, which further aggravate/increase, if the speed of goods stock is lower than the limiting values of 75/95 Km/h. The excessive rail stresses on inner rail would lead to rail flattening besides excessive pressure on track fastening and GR pad of inner rail leading to requirements for replacement of rail and fastening at a shorter life/carried GMT in mixed traffic.</p> <p>Thus, in order to increase speed of passenger stock to 130/160 Km/h, increase of speed of freight stock to 75/95 Km/h is a pre-requisite. Until speed of freight is not raised by improving right powering, trucks and trolleys with better negotiability, better suspension of goods stock etc., raising of passenger stock speed will be an exercise in futility in mixed traffic regime on existing routes.</p> <p>For new routes there is a need to issue instructions that all new constructions including doubling/tripling etc. of lines should be in a manner such that the curvatures are limited to 1° i.e. 1750 m so that the speed potential of 130/160 Km/h is available at the initial stage itself.</p> <p>CR supplemented that the track geometry in projects should be such as to cater for future requirements of higher axle loads, higher speeds up to 200 km/h (especially for curve designs, formation, and bridge design etc.).</p> <p>SCR mentioned that with the increase of speed on existing routes classification based on speed would also need revision.</p> <p>ED/CE(P) mentioned that for existing speeds and rolling stocks, the existing manual provisions are adequate, and for curves and SE designed properly. However if the speed is increased on existing lines, some of the curves may have speed restrictions considering cant, cant deficiency/excess considerations.</p> <p>The existing design of Casnub bogie is having high un-sprung mass and causes high stresses being track unfriendly. Therefore there is need for better alternative like UIC bogie etc. It was mentioned that world over Casnub bogie is not used in mixed traffic conditions. In European railway system also Casnub bogie is not used. PCEs</p>

	<p>were of opinion that over a period of time with wide experience it has been observed that Casnub bogie is not track friendly and an alternative need to be investigated.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For new construction of lines, curvature should be limited to 1°. 2. For existing track speed cannot be increased unless track friendly and better rolling stock (bogie) is deployed. The procurement of Casnub bogie to be discouraged in favour of a better alternative like UIC bogie
<p>1.2 SCR</p>	<p><u>Production and Supply of 52 kg Rails:</u></p> <p>Issue and discussions:</p> <p>Due to limited production of 52 Kg rails various track works like TWR works, Casual renewals, replacement of IMR/DFWR rails, TTR works etc. are seriously affecting. SCR mentioned that as against a requirement of 5,000 MT of 52 Kg rails, only 2,274 MT rails are received. It was also mentioned that to maintain existing 52 kg track as per safe standards, production of 52 Kg rails must be ensured till 52 kg track is totally wiped out.</p> <p>ED/TK(P), Railway Board mentioned that zonal railway may furnish consolidated requirement for 52 Kg rail, duly including rails required for switches, SEJ, and glued joints etc., for inclusion in the rolling plan.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Zonal railway to send consolidated requirement for open line maintenance, for 52 Kg rail, for inclusion in next rolling plan.</p>
<p>1.3 SR</p>	<p><u>Review of Correction Slip No. 3 to USFD Manual:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The correction slip No. 3 to USFD Manual need to be reviewed to include provisions about OBS defects, located within 4 m distance or detected by two or more probes, to be subjected to more frequent USFD testing so that the propagation of OBS flaw is monitored at more frequent intervals. If the OBS flaw propagates into IMR flaw size during such frequent testing, rail renewal has to be carried out within three days as prescribed in the USFD manual.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>1.4 SECR</p>	<p><u>Permitting passenger trains on 1 in 8 ½ Turnouts taking off from inside of the curve:</u></p> <p>Issue & Discussion:</p> <p>The existing stipulations for permitting passenger train on 1 in 8 ½ Turnouts taking off from inside of the curve to be reviewed.</p> <p>SECR mentioned that as per current stipulations of IRPWM Para 410 (2) passenger trains can't be permitted on 1 in 8 ½ T/out taking off from curve in similar flexure. It was mentioned, by ED/CE(P), that this issue is being deliberated in TSC.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>

<p>1.5 NFR</p>	<p><u>Replacement of existing 52 kg Points & Crossings and SEJ with 60 kg Points & Crossings and improved SEJ:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>In view of limited/non-availability of 52 kg rails, due to stoppage of rolling at SAIL/Bhilai, it is not possible to issue rails for fabrication of switches & SEJ. Considering this aspect, all turnouts and SEJ with 52 kg section needs to be replaced by 60 kg rail section.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>CTE/NFR mentioned that in N.F. Railway track has been laid with pre-dominantly 52 kg 90 UTS rails. For maintenance of track as well as for manufacturing of switches, SEJ, Glued joints & Combination SEJ 52 kg rails are required. It is learnt that rolling of 52 kg rails has already been stopped at SAIL/Bhilai. It is also not known as to when these rails would be rolled in future. Even after requirement submitted in the beginning of financial year as well as later on, the arrangement made for only one rake is not serving the purpose.</p> <p>In view of crisis of 52 kg rails, Railway have proposed to replace existing 52 kg Turn out & SEJ with 60 kg rails in the territory of track laid with 52 kg rails. This will improve safety of assets. However, each set of replacement will require 1 set of Turn out, Sleepers lay out, 364 m free rails & 2 set of combination SEJ including SEJ sleepers & 1 set of 1 m long junction fish plate. However, this will replace total track structure with 60 kg from SEJ to adjacent SEJ and increase safety of assets. Though there would be mismatch of rail section but NFR cannot avoid unless & until required 52 kg rails are arranged within 6 month time period.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>1.6 WCR</p>	<p><u>Curve switch assembly:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Increase of gap between the top of stretcher bar and the bottom of stock rail in switch assembly.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>WCR mentioned that as per IRPWM, a gap of 1.5 mm to 3.0 mm between the top face of stretcher bar and the bottom of stock rail in switch assembly is to be maintained. Previously the tongue rail was having a possibility of upward movement of tongue rail during wheel impact on free joint at heel of switch and to arrest this upward movement a gap of 1.5 mm to 3.0 mm between top of stretcher bar & bottom of stock rail was required. Now, in present design of fixed heel curved switches, do not allow upward movement of tongue rail during passage of wheel of rolling stock. However, during the joint inspection of P&C with S&T staff, this gap is mostly found beyond limit (1.5 mm to 3.0 mm), which though having no importance, but it is taken as a deficiency.</p> <p>It was mentioned that this issue is already being deliberated in TSC.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>

<p>1.7 SECR</p>	<p><u>Housing of switches in PSC Turnouts:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Stipulation of specific provision about housing of switches in PSC turnout.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>In case of derailment in yard involving T/out, inadequate housing of switch is recorded, as defect if housing of tongue rail is not available up-to JOH. There is no clear stipulation in IRPWM or T/out drawings indicating the length up-to which housing of switch should take place in normal setting. Since, switch in free & even if, there is not adequate housing, the switch will butt against stock rail during movement of trains and is not expected to lead to any derailment.</p> <p>Installation of Switch Setting Device (SSD) ensures better housing of switch, but most of them have been taken out due to frequent problem in the setting of switches.</p> <p>Some of the PCEs were of the opinion that there is no specific need and requirement for this stipulation and existing instructions are adequate.</p> <p>It was mentioned by Member/Engineering that SSD must be provided in TWS and maintenance of these devices should be taken care.</p> <p>It was mentioned by PCE/WCR that few provisions regarding housing of switches up to six sleepers and provision of axle counters etc. in IRSEM are included suo-moto without routing through Engineering department.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>WCR to make reference to Railway Board regarding unjustified IRSEM provisions.</p>
<p>1.8 NFR</p>	<p><u>Removal of defunct track/components in NFR linked with heritage status of DHR:</u></p> <p>Issue & Discussion:</p> <p>CTE/NFR mentioned that there are 02 nos. special layout BG/NG Crossings in SGUJ-NJP section for maintaining DHR connectivity with NJP. Both the special layout Crossings have been laid on PSC layout sleeper, with inserts at BG/NG track locations secured by fixing dowel and are on good conditions. However, there are no spares available to replace the same. Further the NG line connectivity at NJP is not in use since long and therefore there is no need to have any spares for maintaining this BG/NG Crossings. DHR is being maintained exclusively from Siliguri to Darjeeling as a heritage structure.</p> <p>Additionally, BG/MG track exists as gauntleted track between Siliguri-Bagdogra section (10.07 km) with 4 nos. BG/NG Crossing laid on (PSC sleeper 2 nos. & wooden sleepers 2 nos.) but MG track is not in use since long. Therefore no need to maintain MG track and have spares for special layout. The lifting of MG track between Siliguri-Bagdogra (10.07 Kms.) and NG track between NJP-Siliguri link (07.15 km) has been question marked by DHR, but it is not serving any purpose presently, board is requested to intervene.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>

<p>1.9 NFR</p>	<p><u>Replacement of wooden sleepers by PSC sleepers on Washable Apron in station yards:</u></p> <p>Issue & Discussion:</p> <p>NFR brought out that in major station yard at KIR track was laid on concrete washable aprons with wooden sleeper. During course of time, the wooden sleepers over concrete washable apron have lost its strength due to weathering and exposure to dropping from passenger trains. It is being planned to replace these u/s wooden sleeper with PSC line sleepers confirming to RDSO drawing no. T-2496 without dismantling the existing concrete aprons without infringing the SOD in order to maintain track in safe condition. These aprons are planned for replacement under PH-53 continuously for three years, but due to paucity of fund works are not being sanctioned (being controlled by CCM).</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>1.10 WCR</p>	<p><u>Axle counter fixing on PSC sleepers:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Due to axle counter fixing arrangement on PSC sleepers, tamping of about six sleepers is not feasible.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>WCR mentioned that axle counter fixing on PSC sleepers is possible only with sleeper spacing 72 cm against 60 cm in 1660/km density track. Due to positioning of axle counter the affected sleepers are left un-tamped during machine tamping, if axle counters are not opened, which take at least two hours time in opening and re-fixing. Hence axle counter should be fixed in such a way that machine tamping could be done without opening of axle counter. Axle counters also fail due to machine movement, which requires first train after tamping to pass on authority.</p> <p>ED/CE(P)/Railway Board mentioned that instructions exist to not allow any signal/electrical fixture on track unless it has clearance of Railway Board/concerned track directorate of RDSO, who would also issue drawing for fixing arrangements, which should be ensured in field. He also mentioned that permitting sleeper spacing of 72 cm is quite unlikely and shall not be allowed in any case. Concerned railway, which is having specific issue, may make a reference to Railway Board and RDSO.</p> <p>It was concluded that RDSO may review fixing arrangement of axle counters on PSC sleepers. Meanwhile the details of fixing arrangements for axle counters may be obtained from RDSO, if required.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>RDSO to review fixing arrangement of axle counters on PSC sleepers and propose amendment as necessary.</p>
<p>1.11 WCR</p>	<p><u>Provision of non-corrosive plate crew in PSC sleeper of switch portion:</u></p> <p>Issue & Discussion:</p> <p>There is a practical problem faced by field staff while opening the plate screw in switch portion. Plate screw get severely corroded and jammed with dowels</p>

	<p>resulted plate screw broken inside of dowels and PSC sleepers got damaged. Hence the plate screw should be made with corrosion resistance steel.</p> <p>ED/CE(P) mentioned that this issue has already been deliberated in past, and it was decided that few railways would be conducting trials and send the specifications and performance to RDSO for standardisation and issue necessary guidelines.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>RDSO to review and issue instructions based on reports from zonal railway.</p>
<p>1.12 SR</p>	<p><u>Dispensing Push trolley inspection of track in suburban sections:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>In suburban sections, conducting push trolley inspection is practically not feasible due to frequent train services. The IRPWM provisions should be amended to provide for foot inspection in place of mandatory push-trolley inspections.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SR brought out that Push trolley inspection of track is difficult in suburban sections due to continuous train services, limited space availability by the side of track constraints in permitting speed restriction/traffic block. Due to the practical difficulties, Permanent Way officials are carrying out Push trolley inspection in strenuous conditions taking risk of personal safety since it is a mandatory provision as per IRPWM in schedule of inspections for JE/SSE/P.Way and ADEN. He suggested that Push trolley inspection of track in suburban sections may be dispensed with and intense foot inspection should be introduced.</p> <p>It was mentioned that CR and WR has much larger suburban sections, however no such issue has cropped up. SR may study system being followed on CR and WR to suggest a workable proposal.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>SR to make detailed study of existing practices followed in CR and WR and make suitable proposal for Railway Board's consideration.</p>
<p>1.13 SCR</p>	<p><u>Unlocking of data in TMS for corrections:</u></p> <p>Issue & Discussion:</p> <p>At present the powers for asset data, in TMS, unlocking are vested with Board/ED. PCE/SCR mentioned that the powers for asset unlocking should to be delegated to PCE to correct any wrong data in TMS.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>1.14 NR</p>	<p><u>Use of IT Initiatives by Engineering Officials:</u></p> <p>Issue & Discussion:</p> <p>TMS is finding its roots in Engineering Department for all officials. The Net Books along with USB Dongle are used by P.Way Officials for feeding the data. This requires fairly good Internet connectivity. Since the present Dongle is not efficient, the process is slow.</p> <p>It was suggested that either the railnet connectivity or other products available</p>

	<p>should be provided in the offices of all Engineering officials. The expenditure on the same can be charged to the Contingencies provided in the Track Renewal or other estimates of Engineering Department. Policy Directives on the subject matter are required. Parallely, the concept of Shared Folders should be implemented for sharing of Large Volumes of information between the Field and the Offices of the Divisions/HQrs.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>1.15 WR</p>	<p><u>Review of Inspection schedule of ADEN & DEN/Sr. DENs:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussions:</p> <p>The inspection Schedule of Engg officials needs to be revised time-to-time depending upon development in track maintenance technology, health of track and change in workload due to various policies etc. As a step in this direction some of inspection schedule of ADEN, SSE-overall in-charge and Sectional SSE/JE have been revised last vide correction slip No. 132 of IRPWM.</p> <p>WR suggested that keeping in view the up-gradation of track technology extensive mechanisation, improved strength of track/Safety scenario and change in workload due to various miscellaneous instructions issued time to time at various levels (Board/Zonal/Divisional), it is suggested that some of the inspection schedule of ADEN and Sectional DEN/ Sr. DEN should be revised/rationalised according to necessity of individual inspection.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>1.16 Non-Agenda item</p>	<p><u>Corrosion of Rail resulting in reduction of service life:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussions:</p> <p>A non-agenda item relation to wide spread problem of corrosion of rails was deliberated in detail. The forum considered the fact that due to corrosion, particularly the rails are adversely affected and consequent reduction in its service life. There was a consensus that there is need to find effective measures for prevention of corrosion. For this purpose it was decided to constitute a committee consisting of PCEs of NWR, SER and EDTK(P) to study and suggest suitable remedial measures for improvement.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>A committee consisting of PCEs of NWR, SER and EDTK(P) may be nominated to study the issue of rail corrosion and suggest suitable remedial measures for improvement.</p>
<p><u>2. Track Machines</u></p>	
<p>2.1 SR</p>	<p><u>Separate Plan Head (PH) for the creation of infrastructures for Track Machines like Satellite Depot, Rest House & Sidings:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Creation of a separate Plan Head and allocation of funds for creation of infrastructure for Track Machines under the control of Engineering department for timely creation of infrastructure facilities.</p>

	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>SR brought out that at present creation of infrastructure facilities for track machines are charged to various plan-heads viz. Satellite Depot in Plan Head-42, Rest House in Plan Head-64, Sidings in Plan head 16/64 etc.</p> <p>Since PH-42 is controlled by Mechanical Department, and PH-16 is controlled by Operating Department there is no priority for works for creation of infrastructure facilities for track machines by these Departments and therefore proposals are not getting included in LAW Book & PINK Book. Further in PH-64, there are large number of works and therefore, inclusion of Track Machine infrastructure work is hardly possible. The final result is that in all Railways, these infrastructure facilities are lacking which results in poor maintenance of machines at one end and poor facilities for Track Machine Staff at the other end. Finally, it result in poor output and frequent breakdown of the Track Machines.</p> <p>If a separate Plan Head is created for establishment of infrastructure for Track Machines and separate funds be kept under this Plan Head under the control of Engineering department it would be possible to create infrastructure facilities timely.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Railway Board may examine creation of separate plan head for Track Machine.</p>
<p>2.2 NFR</p>	<p><u>POH Workshop at NJP:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Setting up of POH workshop for NFR and ECR to reduce transit time for machines going for/returning after POH.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Machines earmarked for POH at CPOH/Allahabad are normally losing approximately 4 months on account of POH, and about 45 to 60 days in transit. To increase the availability of Track Machines it was proposed to set up a POH workshop at NJP for ECR as well as NFR with the holding of over 100 machines (57 machines of ECR & 41 machines of NFR) by end of 2017-18. ECR has also given consent for Sonpur & Samastipur divisions, which are adjacent to NFR. NFR has also sent proposal to Railway Board for their consent for setting up of POH at NJP for NFR & ECR.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>The reference made by NFR may be examined at Railway Board.</p>
<p>2.3 NCR</p>	<p><u>Camping Coaches for machines over North Central Railway:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The camping coaches should be sanctioned as part of rolling stock program along with sanction of track machines.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>

<p>2.4 SR</p>	<p><u>Ceiling limit for repair of Track Machines through Cash Imprest:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The ceiling limit of single bill for repair of Track Machines through cash imprest presently limited to Rs. 2,000/- as per Finance Code needs to be enhanced.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>3. Assets Procurement</p>	
<p>3.1 SWR</p>	<p><u>Procurement of P.Way materials for day to day maintenance chargeable to revenue:</u></p> <p>Issue and discussion:</p> <p>Provision of procurement of P.Way materials for day to day maintenance chargeable to revenue instead of being charged to DRF, where no provision is made for such casual renewals.</p> <p>SWR mentioned that besides planned renewal works, number of track fittings and components are required to be replaced during the course of maintenance of P-Way. As per Finance Code casual renewals of rails, sleepers fittings etc., are to be charged to DRF. But under DRF, no provision is made for procurement of materials for such casual renewals. There is a need to modify the para 758 of IRFC Vol-I to the effect that all casual renewals are to be charged to revenue. Alternatively under DRF specific allotment needs to be made for procurement of materials for Casual Renewals.</p> <p>After detailed deliberation the forum is of the view that specific issues, if any, would be referred to Railway Board with finance views.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>3.2 SER</p>	<p><u>Power for signing of indents for procurement of P. Way fittings:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussions:</p> <p>For procurement of P. Way fittings the power of signing of requisitions should be enhanced.</p> <p>PCE/SER mentioned that P. Way fittings are considered as Non-Stock items for its procurement and the power of signing of Non-Stock demands/requisitions is mentioned in Rly. Bd.'s letter wherein SAG officers are required to sign Non-Stock requisitions exceeding Rs. 3 lakhs but less than 15 lakhs and PHOD/CHOD officers of User department are required to sign requisitions exceeding Rs. 15 lakhs.</p> <p>For procurement of P. Way fittings the power of signing of requisitions should be enhanced. SAG officers of concerned department should be required to sign requisitions in excess of Rs. 50 lakhs.</p> <p>AM/CE mentioned that the stores procurements are made in accordance with stores codes. Any specific issues with justification should be referred to Railway Board through General Manager.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>

<p>3.3 SER</p>	<p><u>Expediting Supply of P.Way materials – Allowing suppliers to manufacture and stock P.Way materials:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Allowing firms to keep stock of P. Way materials like Switches, CMS Crossings, SEJs etc. up to 15% of their total capacity in manufactured/fabricated condition and ready for inspection of RDSO so that on issue of LOA, the firm can immediately arrange RDSO’s inspection and issue that stock immediately to field on receiving Purchase Orders.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>																				
<p>3.4 WCR</p>	<p><u>Procurement of small fittings for maintenance of track through item rate contracts:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>Timely supply of small fittings for track maintenance becomes difficult due to long process of placement of indents, calling and finalization of tenders by Track Procurement cell, therefore it is suggested that, system of item rate contracts similar to DGS&D rate contracts may be followed for procurement of small fittings from RDSO approved firms.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>																				
<p>3.5 CR</p>	<p><u>Enhanced delegation of powers for items pertaining to Track Procurement:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Enhancement of powers for procurement.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/CR mentioned that power for tender committee meeting and acceptance of tender pertaining to Track Procurement needs revision and is proposed as under:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="261 1290 1361 1491"> <thead> <tr> <th>Officer</th> <th>Convenor of Tender Committee Present</th> <th>Proposed</th> <th>Acceptance</th> <th>Power proposed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Senior Scale</td> <td>Up-to 45 lakh</td> <td>Up-to 3 Cr.</td> <td>Nil</td> <td>Nil</td> </tr> <tr> <td>JAG/SG</td> <td>45 lakh to 3 Cr.</td> <td>3 Cr. to 8 Cr.</td> <td>Up-to 45 lakh</td> <td>Up-to 3 Cr.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SAG</td> <td>3 Cr. To 20 Cr.</td> <td>8 Cr. to 20 Cr.</td> <td>45 lakh to 3 Cr</td> <td>3 Cr. to 8 Cr.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Due to limited power of tendering at JAG/SG level, most of track procurement tenders are being dealt at SAG level resulting into increased workload at SAG level. This is resulting into delay in finalization of tenders.</p> <p>AM/CE mentioned that the stores procurements are made in accordance with stores codes. Any specific issues with justification should be referred to Railway Board through General Manager.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Railway may refer the case to stores directorate of Railway Board through General Manager.</p>	Officer	Convenor of Tender Committee Present	Proposed	Acceptance	Power proposed	Senior Scale	Up-to 45 lakh	Up-to 3 Cr.	Nil	Nil	JAG/SG	45 lakh to 3 Cr.	3 Cr. to 8 Cr.	Up-to 45 lakh	Up-to 3 Cr.	SAG	3 Cr. To 20 Cr.	8 Cr. to 20 Cr.	45 lakh to 3 Cr	3 Cr. to 8 Cr.
Officer	Convenor of Tender Committee Present	Proposed	Acceptance	Power proposed																	
Senior Scale	Up-to 45 lakh	Up-to 3 Cr.	Nil	Nil																	
JAG/SG	45 lakh to 3 Cr.	3 Cr. to 8 Cr.	Up-to 45 lakh	Up-to 3 Cr.																	
SAG	3 Cr. To 20 Cr.	8 Cr. to 20 Cr.	45 lakh to 3 Cr	3 Cr. to 8 Cr.																	

<p>3.6 WR</p>	<p><u>Merging of Approved Vendor for the supply of P. Way items of 52 Kg and 60 Kg rail section:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Merging of Approved Vendor for the supply of P. Way items of 52 Kg and 60 Kg rail section.</p> <p>Discussions:</p> <p>WR brought out that there is separate list of approved vendor for the supply of P. Way material/fittings of 52 Kg and 60 Kg rail sections. Logically any RDSO approved vendor for any rail section can manufacture the material suitable for either rail section. Merging of Approved Vendors will simplify the vendor list, improve the competitiveness in the tender and reduce the paperwork at RDSO for approval of vendors for 52 Kg and 60 Kg separately.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>RDSO may consider merging of Approved Vendors for the supply of P. Way items of 52 Kg and 60 Kg rail section.</p>
<p><u>4. Operations, Safety and Accidents</u></p>	
<p>4.1 NR</p> <p>4.2 WCR</p>	<p><u>Improving the Mobility by Engineers:</u></p> <p><u>Advantage of increasing Engineering Time Allowance:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Enhancement of ETA to undertake line capacity enhancement, and track works and facilitation of execution by grant of traffic blocks, power etc.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>NR raised the issue that with mechanization of Track Renewal & Track maintenance of heavy PRC sleeper Track Structure, the performance of track machines is a vital & important parameter not only for Engineering Department but also for SAFETY ON TRACKS. The elimination of UMLC, executions of Doublings are also required at a very large scale on NR. Although numbers of instruction, jointly issued by Engg. & Traffic Directorate, are issued by Railway Board, but the onus of implementation is left to Engineers in the field as per the present experience. These instructions are concerned with working of Track Machines and ETA. There are contradictory Key Performance Parameters of Punctuality for Operating Department (in particular) and Mechanised Track Renewals, LHS works and Doublings (Engg. Department.).</p> <p>A detailed analysis was made about this issue by NR, who suggested that The ETAs should be enhanced, as required, for a year or two with suitable changes in Time Tabling for completion of safety related & infrastructural improvement works and The Sanctity of the Traffic Blocks needs to be jointly owned by both “Operating & Executive” Departments with concept of dedicated Powers/Crew for movement of DMTs should be introduced. It was also suggested that to overcome the problem of vacancies in Safety Categories (Crew), the options of Re-employment should be exercised.</p>

	<p>PCE/WCR mentioned that advantage of increasing 50% Engineering Time Allowance on account of increase in speed and relaxation of PSRs is required, but Operating Department of WCR has not agreed for the proposal moved several times. Suitable guidelines need to be issued from Railway Board with the consent of Traffic Directorate.</p> <p>AM/CE mentioned that at railway board it has been suggested to safety task force that adherence of corridor blocks should be made as performance parameter for GM/DRM and COM/Sr. DOM to bring in discipline. EDCE(P) mentioned that these issues amongst others are also projected to the safety task force constituted recently for consideration.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Railway to project their requirement of ETA to COM for inclusion in working timetable. If the projected ETA is not included, Railway Board may be appraised.</p>
<p>4.3 WCR</p>	<p><u>Anomaly between IRPWM and G& SR:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussions:</p> <p>PCE/WCR mentioned that there are certain discrepancies noticed in various provisions of IRPWM and G&SR viz.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) As per IRPWM Chapter IX Par 910 (1/a)- two hand signal lamp tricolour provided. As per G&SR Para SR 16.02.1(2) – three tricolour hand signal lamp. (ii) IRPWM Chapter IX Para 910 (1/i) Correction slip no.135-02 nos. banner flag. As per G&SR Par 16.02.01 (3) – 03 banner flag. (iii) IRPWM Chapter 910 (Y) –Provision with fuses. As per G&SR Para SR. 16.02.01(7) CS No. 19 (GR.3.65 & SR 3.65.1 Page 73. CS No. 10) – Three LED red flashing signal on single/double /multiple lines. <p>EDCE(P) mentioned that this item was discussed in TSC in past and necessary correction slip to IRPWM has already been issued.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>4.4 WCR</p>	<p><u>Clarification regarding Policy Circular No. 6:</u></p> <p>Issue discussions:</p> <p>PCE/WCR mentioned that as per policies no 6 appendix (1) route proving run is required to be conducted to clear the speed of a train speed of up-to 120 km/h, beyond 110 km/h but it is not clear what exactly is required to be done viz. how many OMSs are required to be installed and what location, and how many coaches e.g. for 24 coaches if 4 type of coaches are there, how many OMSs are required. This needs to be clarified to avoid confusion. For COCR also, this confusion exists. The detailed procedure and action to be taken by railways and RDSO should be clearly spelt out.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>

<p>4.6 SCR</p>	<p><u>Nominated Rolling Stock to adopt Cant Deficiency of 100 mm:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussions:</p> <p>PCE/SCR requested to advise list of nominated rolling stock for which C_d 100 mm to be considered. As per para 406(2)(a) of IRPWM, cant Deficiency (C_d) can be taken as 100 mm on routes with track maintained to C&M-I Vol.I standards for nominated rolling stock with permission of PCE. The details are essentially required to increase C_d in connection with Mission Raftaar.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>RDSO to circulate the details of rolling stock eligible for cant deficiency of 100 mm.</p>
<p>4.7 SR</p>	<p><u>Air Suspension of EMU Coaches involved in Derailment – Revision of accident pro-forma and review of air suspension:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The pro-forma for recording rolling stock defect after accident needs revision to include relevant parameters that can contribute to derailments.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SR mentioned that there has been spurt in the number of derailments involving EMU coaches with air suspension on turnouts. The existing accident pro-forma does not contain details related to secondary suspension (i.e. air suspension). In fact, there are no details available in the accident pro-forma for EMU/DEMU/MEMU coaches. Subsequently, Enquiry Reports in such derailments have concluded that track parameter is the only cause of derailments ignoring the suspension system and other defects of EMU/DEMU coaches. The derailment of coaches with air suspension is taking place even at locations where twist in the track is negligible.</p> <p>After a recent derailment of EMU in Chennai division it was suggested that a detailed study of recent derailment of EMU coaches with air suspension may be carried out and a new format for taking Joint observation at accident site exclusively for EMU stock is to be made. For air suspension, the parameters to be measured are to be clearly spelt out. It was also revealed that as per the accident manual, item D4 of Appendix G2, no parameter pertaining to secondary suspension (air suspension) could be measured.</p> <p>Accident enquiries tend to conclude, without analyzing the rail wheel interaction mechanism that the derailment is due to “Track parameters were not maintained within permissible limit”. The parameters, of EMUs as well as other newer rolling stocks like BCN etc., contributory to derailment are being ignored, as there is no provision of measuring them in the pro-forma of accident manual.</p> <p>PCE/SR also suggested that the accident pro-forma be revised duly including the measurements of safety parameters for existing rolling stocks and EMUs like air suspension etc. Further, review of features of air suspension system in EMU ICF coaches to be done.</p> <p>He also mentioned that a detailed study has been conducted by WR & SR, findings are already shared with ED/Track-1/RDSO.</p>

	<p>Recommendations:</p> <p>WR and SR to make a detailed reference to RDSO for examination.</p>
4.8 SR	<p><u>Scabbing/Wheel burns of rails - Right powering of Locos for hauling CC+8+2/CC+6+2 rakes as per RDSO Load table:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>Implementation of provisions/guidelines stipulated for running of CC+8+2/CC+6+2/25T loads, duly allowing overpowering as required to avoid occurrence of scabs/wheel burns.</p> <p>ED/CE(P) mentioned that instructions have already been issued by Railway Board to GMs, which may be followed up by PCEs. Difficulties in implementation of these instructions, if any, may be brought to the notice of Railway Board.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
4.9 NCR	<p><u>Suitable mechanism for taking corrective action on detection of Critical alarm from WILD:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Setting up of a suitable mechanism for taking corrective action on detection of Critical and Maintenance alarm from WILD so that the stipulation of JPO to get the suspected stock detached and attended at the next TXR point is followed.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Installation of WILD is a pre-requisite for running of CC+8+2T / CC+6+2T loaded trains. The JPO dated 29.07.08 approved by Board (MM, MT & ME) for action to be taken in case of Alarm of WILD stipulates that the WILD equipment reading of ILF and wheel impact will be continuously monitored by the TXR staff of the installation and whenever the same reaches the critical alarm level.</p> <p>TXR staff on receiving the data from the equipment will intimate the concerned section controller who in turn will arrange to get the suspected stock detached and attended at the next TXR point, which is supposed to be around 15-50 Km from the equipment. In case, there is no TXR point within next 50 km, the suspect stock shall be detached at the next convenient station/yard within 50 Km. Under no circumstances, the suspect stock shall be permitted to ply for more than 50 Km. Though detachment on this account, on NCR, has improved in 2015-16 & 2016-17, but it needs further improvement.</p> <p>Hence, a suitable mechanism must be in place for taking corrective action on detection of Critical and Maintenance alarm from WILD so that the above stipulation of JPO to get the suspected stock detached and attended at the next TXR point are followed.</p> <p>ED/CE(P) mentioned that instructions have already been issued for monitoring of weigh bridges and WILD. It was also desired that the summery of critical alarms from WILD should be forwarded to railway Board.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Zonal Railways to monitor working of weigh bridges and WILD in accordance with Railway Board's instructions.</p>

<p>4.10 SCR</p>	<p><u>Moped trolley without block should be permitted for inspections by SrDEN/DENs:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SCR mentioned that use of moped trolley should be permitted without traffic block as helps in completing inspection schedules particularly for long jurisdictions and to inspect vulnerable and important locations frequently.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>4.11 SCR</p>	<p><u>Increase of re-validation time for BPC (for BOBYN, BFR & BRN wagons):</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>Revalidation time for BPC for BOBYN, BFR & BRN wagons shall be increased to 2 months from the existing one-month.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>SCR to make a reference to Railway Board through CME.</p>
<p>4.12 CR</p>	<p><u>Adherence to code/manual provisions:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>Relaxation on provisions of SOD IRPWM & other codes/manuals in various Projects/Works should not be allowed. The provisions of codes/manuals in Maintenance of Track, Bridges and other structures should be strictly followed. It will save field officers whenever any mishap takes place.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>4.13 NCR</p>	<p><u>Access/Switching over to Operating frequency to the Walkie-talkie sets provided to Engg. Supervisors:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>NCR mentioned that the walkie-talkie sets presently provided to Engineering supervisors have only one frequency on which only Engineering to Engineering both way communication is possible. But, there is no access to Operating frequency, not even for one-way communication (i.e. listening).</p> <p>If the facility of switching over to operating frequency on walkie-talkies of engineering supervisors is also extended, it will not only help in avoiding train detention in case of unusual and engineering blocks, but the safety of trains as well as the Inspecting official will also be ensured.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>4.14 WR</p>	<p><u>Changes in Schedule of Dimension (gap between track centre and landing of Foot Over Bridges for Mumbai suburban section):</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Western Railway had sent a proposal to Railway Board for reducing the minimum gap between track centre and landing of Foot Over Bridges for Mumbai suburban section. The proposal was, to reduce the minimum desirable gap from 5,330 mm to 4,720 mm. This will facilitate in providing wider stairs, which will facilitate faster passenger evacuation. Since there isn't any trolley movement on suburban</p>

	<p>platform there should not be any constraints in reducing this width. The reduced gap is already prescribed gap for isolated structures on platform.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>4.15 WR</p>	<p><u>Changes in Schedule of Dimension (Minimum Horizontal distance of any building /continuous structures and isolated structures on passenger platforms):</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>The existing provision of Schedule of Dimension about minimum horizontal distance (5.33 m) for any building /continuous structures and isolated structures on passenger platforms is on higher side leading to high number for requirement for condonation leading to delay in various works of FOB construction etc.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>5. Man Power Planning</p>	
<p>5.1 SCR SECR SWR</p>	<p><u>Yard stick for creation of posts in P.Way, Works & Bridge cadre for new projects/assets:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Laying down yardsticks for creation of posts in works & bridge cadre and revision of existing yardstick for P.Way, which was issued long ago.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SCR mentioned that during handing over of new projects to Open Line, Construction Organization prepares manpower requirement for maintenance of new projects/assets (including P.Way, Works & Bridges cadres) and the proposals are submitted to respective divisions to obtain associate finance concurrence and approval at divisional level. Divisions, work out the requirement as per yard stick etc. and submit the proposals to HQrs. for obtaining HQrs. finance concurrence & GM's sanction for creation of the required number of posts.</p> <p>Many a times, FA&CAO returns the proposals stating that yardstick followed is very old and that the requirement is not worked out properly (particularly in Works & Bridge cadres). The targeted projects are commissioned without meeting the manpower requirement for the assets, which involves safety of track.</p> <p>PCE/SECR also emphasised that there is no yardstick for work load of SSE/Bridge unit, who is responsible for maintenance of all major bridges of spans 12.20 m and above & other steel structures like FOB, Workshop gantries etc. New bridges are also added every year on account of construction of new lines, gauge conversion and doubling etc., which has increased the workload of Bridge organization. In absence of any yardstick for the Bridge cadre, it becomes difficult to create new posts of SSE, bridge erectors, MCM etc. Suitable yardsticks for Bridge cadre need to be laid down.</p> <p>PCE/SWR supplemented that MCNTM formula caters for the requirement of Trackmen. At present, there is no guideline for creation of supervisors, technicians and other staff for Bridge maintenance, maintenance of buildings and P-Way maintenance etc. Due to lack of standard norms and instructions on the subject, it is difficult to justify and create such posts.</p>

	<p>It was suggested that yardsticks to be formulated to maintain minimum works and Bridge cadre strength to maintain vast Railway assets like stations, platforms, colonies, service buildings, rest houses, training centres etc. based on ITKM similar to MCNTM formula. Also the existing yardstick for P.Way was issued long ago hence revised yardstick to be issued.</p> <p>During discussions it was mentioned that a committee has already been constituted for formulation of yardstick for bridge cadre.</p> <p>The issue was discussed threadbare and forum was of the view that a comprehensive review needs to be done for which a committee can be constituted to make suggestions for consideration of Railway Board.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>A committee consisting of CGEs of SCR, WCR, WR, and Faculty from IRICEN can be constituted to deliberate and make suitable recommendations for consideration of Railway Board.</p>
<p>5.2 WCR NER SCR NFR NR</p> <p>5.3 SR</p> <p>5.9 NCR</p>	<p><u>Creation of posts for maintenance of new assets:</u></p> <p><u>Post creation for Track Machines:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Creation of posts for maintenance of new assets.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCEs of railways, which proposed this agenda item expressed concern about inability to create posts as the proposal are not being accepted by Railway Board and Personnel Branch/Associate Finance for want of matching surrender of existing vacant posts, which is not possible, in view of their requirement for respective maintenance.</p> <p>Due to consistent surrender of posts in works-cadre in last 14- 15 years, no scope is now left for ensuring matching surrender from within the Engineering department. Further, there is not adequate balance fund in zonal vacancy bank.</p> <p>In case of non-provision of money value from Board's vacancy Bank, Board may consider delinking the issue of creation of posts for maintenance of new lines with matching surrenders, as in the case of running categories so as to enable this Railway in creating the required number of posts to ensure timely opening of new assets and for proper maintenance of the same in view of safety involved.</p> <p>NFR highlighted that there is immediate need for creation and filling of 1693 posts of track maintainer for Sections, which have already been commissioned/likely to be commissioned and 2154 posts of Gatemen are required to be created for LC's already manned/likely to be manned in near future. And such a huge requirement can not be met with matching surrender, therefore Railway Board should consider creation of these additional posts in Safety Category without matching surrender as an one time exception.</p> <p>NR underlined that the Matching Surrenders are not available because of the other Target of reduction of 1% of Sanction Strength given by the Railway Board. Besides the surrenders of Non-Safety Categories are also being done on account of Works Studies.</p>

	<p>It is suggested that this stipulation of providing matching surrenders for Safety Categories should be dispensed with, because the Funds under Revenue are not available for outsourcing the activities.</p> <p>AM/CE mentioned that vacancies that exist in non-safety categories, which have not been filled over past few years, could be offered for matching surrender to provide partial relief.</p> <p>PCE/SR highlighted that there are no non-safety category posts are available in the Railway and Railways are forced to surrender the safety category posts of Track Maintainer to create the post of Track Machine. The sanctioned strength of Track Maintainer is already become lesser than what is required as per MCNTM formulae. He suggested that creation of posts for Track Machines (new asset) should be done without matching surrender as recommended by <i>“HIGH POWER COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE DUTY HOURS OF RUNNING AND OTHER SAFETY RELATED CATEGORIES OF STAFF”</i> for timely creation of posts for Track Machines.</p> <p>PCE/SCR and SR further mentioned that that some of the categories in bridge cadre and some posts in even works cadre, which are essentially required for minor bridges maintenance, are not even included in the Safety category, which suggest that the there is need for revision of the list of safety category posts.</p> <p>NCR mentioned that for further creation of posts for track machines by providing matching surrender, being new Railway, matching surrender of posts is not possible as there is already shortage of P. Way staff (safety category) due to creation of new assets in recent past.</p> <p>It will be possible to create required posts for track machine staff if money value for creation of posts against new assets is made available by Railway Board or by issuing suitable instruction not to insist matching surrender for creation of such posts as further surrender of trackmen post will affect track maintenance work.</p> <p>Member Engineering mentioned that matching surrender for creation of posts for new assets would not be from Engineering department alone as these new assets are to for the zonal railway and matching surrender from non-safety category across other department should also be considered for creation of posts. However for creation of posts for track machine, surrender of trackmen posts would have to be made, if required.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The existing list of Safety category posts should be reviewed. 2. For sanction of posts in safety category no matching surrender should be necessary as recommended by High Power committee.
<p>5.4 SCR</p> <p>5.8 NFR</p>	<p><u>Vacancies in Track Maintainer Cadre:</u></p> <p><u>Filling up of Vacancies in Track Maintainer Category:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Track Maintainer posts are not being filled up despite follow up.</p>

	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SCR mentioned that the vacancies in Track Maintainer category are not being filled up and shortage of man further increase as Trackmen leaving the job after their recruitment due to strenuous nature of duties etc. Being the safety category posts these are essentially required for ensuring maintenance of safety of track by way of patrolling of track round the clock. This issue has already been brought to the notice of Railway Board.</p> <p>PCE/SCR suggested that there should be a time bound calendar for recruitment of all Engineering posts for uniformity in all Zonal Railways duly taking in to account percentage for non-materialization of papers. He also opined that there is a need to review the recruitment process of Track Maintainer by revising the norms for Physical Efficiency Test as the present norms are considered to be too liberal to test the physical ability of the candidates to perform the strenuous nature of work attached to the post of Track Maintainer and more weightage should be given to the physical efficiency test in the recruitment process and persons with higher qualifications need not be called for the posts of Tr. Maintainers.</p> <p>NFR requested that Railway Board may consider empowering RRC's to recruit these safety category posts as per Board's guideline annually and regularly without waiting for formal sanction of Railway Board every year. This will ensure timely filling up of vacancies in Safety Category.</p> <p>It was mentioned that this issue of filling up is being pursued at Railway Board.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>5.5 NFR</p>	<p><u>Introduction of MMU concept with Utilization of old Track Machines.</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>NFR mentioned that in view of large no of vacancies of Track maintainers in new lines recently taken over by Open line where number of trains is also 2 to 3 pairs. N.F. Railway proposed to introduce MMU concept with utilization of old aged machines for branch lines. For every 40 to 50 km section at centralized location one machine with Gang strength of 20 Track maintainers has been proposed for outsourcing. As the major man-power requirement would be for patrolling, the track machine could be used as patrol vehicle. However, routine inspection by Key men and Patrolling (Monsoon, Hot/Cold) will be done by Departmental Gangs.</p> <p>It was mentioned that this issue of filling up is being pursued at Railway Board.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>5.6 WCR NWR</p>	<p><u>Allotment of additional funds under Revenue Head for maintenance of new assets:</u></p> <p><u>Shortage of P.Way Maintenance staff & requirement of out sourcing:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>Since creation of posts for maintenance of new assets is a time consuming process, it is required to allot additional fund under Revenue Head for outsourcing of maintenance of these new assets to ensure safety of running track and trains.</p>

	<p>It was mentioned that this issue re-appropriation of funds across PUs for Pay and allowances and 27, 28 and 32 is also being pursued at Railway Board.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>5.7 NR WCR</p>	<p><u>Recruitment process for Track Maintainer:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The recruitment process for Track Maintainer should be changed to recruit persons suitable for track work.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>It was brought-out that the present recruitment process has drawback of no upper limit of education resulting in highly educated candidates joining as Trackmen who do not want to perform the duties of Trackmen. Further there is no bar on recruitment of female candidates, who are not interested in performing of gang duties in mid sections for Safety reasons.</p> <p>For recent few years the women candidates have joined as Track Maintainer and their number is considerable and Railway Board have asked to post them at places having adequate facilities of accommodation and safety. For this purpose the most of the lady Track Maintainer are working in the gang unit stationed at major cities and their numbers in those gangs are quite high. As they are not capable of doing the hard job of Track Maintainer, they finally end up doing some clerical job in offices resulting in track works of such units are affected badly and it is also not reflected in the vacancy position.</p> <p>The issue was discussed in great details and it was opined that there is need to review. Further the additional activities, which could be out-sourced, should also be identified. It was suggested that a committee could be formed to look into the matter comprehensively.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>A committee comprising of PCEs of SCR (Convenor), WCR and Director/IRICEN may be nominated to study the issue comprehensively and make suitable recommendations.</p>
<p>5.10 NFR</p>	<p><u>Man Power Planning in Track Machine Organisation:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>There is delay in filling-up of posts, by RRB, in track machine organization.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>NFR raised an issue of delays by RRBs in filling up of vacant posts. It was mentioned that though a written Examination took place on 14-12-2014 and 15-06-2014, however till date panel not received from RRB/GHY. In another case no feedback is coming from RRB about the status.</p> <p>Member/Engineering mentioned that considering the prevailing financial situation of lower earning and high expenditure, it would be extremely difficult to fill up vacant posts. We need to devise means to work with existing staff and outsourcing of some of the activities and think out of box to find workable solution. However</p>

	<p>NFR was advised to refer the issue to Railway Board and pursue.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>5.11 NFR</p>	<p><u>Induction of Trackmen into other department:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>After the restricting of Trackmen cadre implemented as per Board's instructions career Progression has been ensured, and they are eligible now for promotion to the post up-to Grade Pay Rs. 2800/-. With that very little purpose in induction of Trackman into other departments to improve promotional aspect.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>5.12 WCR</p>	<p><u>Refresher of Gatekeeper:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>Anomaly between IRPWM para 1504, G&SR chapter – XVI Para -16.01 (b) & (e) and Rly. Board L. No. E (MPP)2009/3/17 dated 02-12-10 regarding frequency of refresher of Gate Keepers.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>5.13 SCR</p>	<p><u>Duty list of JE/P.Way (erstwhile PWS/Supervisor (P.Way)):</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>Railway Board has issued the order for merger of Sr. PWS with JE/P.Way with its spread effect. Consequent to the implementation of the above Board's orders, there is no post of PWS/ Sr. PWS post existing on the Railways and whole P.Way cadre is divided in to two categories i.e. SSE/P.Way and JE/P.Way.</p> <p>As per the duties attached to the post of erstwhile Sr. PWS they are normally in charge of items of works which require a higher level supervision that can be exercised by gang mate as gang mates promoted from trackmen category by virtue of their seniority may not have the requisite technical qualification/ standards to supervise/execute the track maintenance work independently.</p> <p>With the merger of Sr. PWS posts with JE/P.Way and also in the absence of specific instructions from Board, regarding the duty lists of SSE/P.Way and JE/P.Way, after the said merger, the staff at unit level cannot be taken up for fixing the responsibilities for improper maintenance of track. With the result, divisions are finding it very difficult to manage the duties attached to the post of erstwhile Sr. PWS, which may adversely affect the safe maintenance of track.</p> <p>In this connection, Railway Board have constituted a committee for comprehensive review to suggest the suitable structure of P.Way staff based on actual field data along with the corresponding changes in duties and responsibilities of P.Way staff in IRPWM and other Manuals.</p> <p>PCE/SCR mentioned that SCR had sent observations/remarks to Railway Board and requested take suitable decision and issue necessary instructions at the earliest.</p> <p>It was mentioned that the proposal is under consideration of Railway Board.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Railway Board may expedite.</p>

<p>5.14 NFR</p>	<p><u>Overloading of Duties of SSE/P.Way/In-Charge:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Senior Section Engineer/P.Way/In-charge are overloaded with Special Drives and Compliance of Instructions given by their superiors in addition to their own inspections and compliances for maintaining safety of assets.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>5.15 NR</p>	<p><u>Use of D&G provision for designated purpose:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>There is specific provision of D&G Charges in the Track Renewal Estimates both for Establishment and other than Establishment. The provision of Establishment portion is being used for Work charged Posts of Supervisors and Officers who are working in Open Line for maintenance related work including Division/HQrs. Therefore, the benefit of having SSE/P.Way/Spl. and/or DEN/Track etc. is not available with the Organisation for supervision of Track Renewal works. With the result the burden of supervision comes on the shoulders of the Supervisors In-charges of Maintenance. Thus, maintenance of the tracks suffers and so the Quality of Running. It was suggested that such posts manned for maintenance should be converted to Revenue. The D&G Charges should be therefore, utilized for supervision of Track Renewal work only.</p> <p>ME stated that with the restructuring of cadre, a significant number of work charged posts would get converted into revenue posts.</p> <p>PCE/SCR mentioned that for other departments, even for capital intensive works the D&G percentages is even higher.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Railway Board to consider existing provisions for D&G charges and rationalize.</p>
<p>5.16 SCR</p>	<p><u>1% criteria for surrender of post each year:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>The calculation is done for total staff including safety category but surrender has to be done from non-safety staff. This is affecting the cadre strength very badly and position is coming such that it is not practically possible to maintain all assets. Therefore percentage surrender should be calculated only for non-safety category.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>SCR to refer the issue to Railway Board</p>
<p>5.17 NER</p>	<p><u>Problem in Promotion to Track Maintainer Categories and benefits of LARGESS:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>As per norms/procedure for future promotion in the Unified Cadre of Track Maintainer Track Maintainer-1 (PB-I GPO-2800) has been made selection post through trade-test. This category consists of Mate & Keymen and this selection is to be done at divisional level by Personnel department, which takes a lot of time. Earlier selection of Keymen was done at the level of ADENs by which process was within control of Engineering department and could be expedited as per need.</p>

	<p>During discussions it emerged that there are different practices being followed for selection at either divisional level or by ADEN in zonal railways, and there is need for uniformity in selection procedure.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Railway Board may issue necessary clarification.</p>
<p>5.18 NER</p>	<p><u>Change in AVC for Promotion to Artisan in P.Way Cadre:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>As per existing AVC for promotion to Artisan (P.Way as well works), feeder category is Khalasi helper. However, there is no more Khalasi helper available in P.Way Cadre. The Track maintainers are not eligible as per existing AVC. Due to this, a lot of problem is being faced in filling of promotion quota of Artisan in P.Way Cadre. Even if post of Artisan (specially Blacksmith, welder etc.) is filled up from helper Khalasi in works cadre, they do not possess the skill of blacksmith required on P.Way. On the other hand, trackmen who are doing job of blacksmith/welder etc. on P.Way in field do not get opportunity for promotion. Therefore the Track Maintainer (III & IV) should also be made eligible for appearing selection of Artisans.</p> <p>The issue was also raised with CPO/NER, who advised that it need to be referred to Railway Board.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>NER to make reference, through CPO/NER, to Railway Board.</p>
<p>5.19 CR</p>	<p><u>Need for revision in schedule of disciplinary powers for Assistant officers and senior supervisors in Zonal Railways:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Assistant officers & senior supervisors to be given more powers to initiate disciplinary action.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/CR raised the issue of declining discipline amongst field staff and emphasised need for granting more powers to Assistant officers & senior supervisors powers to initiate disciplinary action against erring staff. It was also mentioned that earlier Assistant Officers was having power for suspension up to JE-II and other disciplinary power of minor/ major penalties No. (i) to (vi) up to level of JE-1. Now he is having Disciplinary power of suspension and minor/major penalties No. (i) to (vi) up to the Track Maintainer Gr -I (Mate/Keyman) only. Further, supervisor's in-charge was having power for suspension up to Mate and other disciplinary power of minor penalties up to level of JE-II, whereas now he is having Disciplinary power of suspension and minor penalties No. (i) to (iv) up to Track Maintainer Grade -II only. (Which excludes most of mate and key men who are in Grade -I.)</p> <p>In view of above disciplinary powers of Assistant officers of and senior supervisor in-charge need to be reviewed for better discipline and effective control.</p> <p>The forum opined that the Railway Board may consider proposal of CR.</p>

	<p>Recommendations: CR to send a detailed proposal to Railway Board for consideration.</p>
5.20 WR	<p><u>Issue of a uniform policy by Railway Board for payment of overtime to track machine operators JE/SSE:</u></p> <p>In Western Railway the operators of track machines are considered as supervisory staff and hence not paid overtime. However, role & responsibilities of a operator of the track machines is moreover similar to a Loco-pilot and therefore the operator also deserves to be paid the overtime. This will help in a big way to improve the utilisation of available track machines and also to cope up with the shortage of track machines staff.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
5.21 WR	<p><u>Issuing of guidelines by Railway Board for increasing of requirement of Rest Givers (RG) from 25% to 42% for implementation of 3 weeks roster for track machine staff:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussions:</p> <p>For implementing 3-week roster for Track Machine staff, the requirement of RG would increase from 25% to 42%. Presently due to a large number of vacancies against the existing sanctioned cadre as well as additional requirement of RG, Western Railway is not able to implement 3 weeks roster. WR requested that necessary instructions from Railway Board to be issued early.</p> <p>It was mentioned that the 3-week roster was tried on SECR, and the experience was quite encouraging. However on some of the railway it has not received favourable response.</p> <p>Recommendations: Railway board to examine.</p>
<p>6. Delegation of Powers, Budget, Tenders and Contracts</p>	
6.1 SER	<p><u>Increase in GM's power & Norms for sanction of New Works:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>In view of Railway's policy of decentralization of powers, the powers of GM for sanction of New works needs increase.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
6.2 NCR	<p><u>Delegation of Powers to Zonal Railways:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Powers of zonal railways to be enhanced/liberalised for expeditious decisions and better utilization of funds and there should not be any restriction for the Safety related works and other than Safety related works. The decision of GM should be final for sanctioning the work either Safety related or other than Safety related works within budgetary ceiling of Rs. 12 Cr. Similarly there should be enhancement of power of GM to sanction Traffic facility works up-to Rs. 2.5 Cr.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>

<p>6.3 CR</p>	<p><u>Increase of quotation powers for SAG officers:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>Quotation power of SAG officer should be enhanced from present Rs. 4 lakh per case to Rs. 20 lakhs per case with annual ceiling of Rs. 1.5 Cr.</p> <p>It was mentioned that there was a similar item in CAO(C) seminar also, and Railway Board may consider it since lot of difficulties were being faced in the field.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Railway Board to consider enhancement of quotation powers.</p>
<p>6.4 CR</p>	<p><u>Increase of powers to sanction work orders under zonal contract:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>Ceiling limit for sanctioning of individual work order in zonal contract to be raised from 2 lakh to 5 lakh for effective improvement of residential and service buildings.</p> <p>PCEs were of the view that this increase is overdue, considering the inflation since previous revision,</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Railway board to consider increase of powers to sanction work orders under zonal contracts.</p>
<p>6.5 SCR</p>	<p><u>Sufficient budget allotment for new PB items under PH 3100 (Track Renewal):</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SCR has raised the issue that Budget allotted for new PB items (i.e. TRR/CTR/TWR/TTRR) is normally inadequate to meet the expenditure towards booking of materials, etc. the associate Finance has been objecting to pass bills, as required funds are not allotted under each work, due to this progress is held up.</p> <p>It was requested that the PCEs be empowered to re-appropriate funds to various works within Track Renewal plan head. Otherwise suitable instructions may be issued to Finance Department for passing of expenditure as a whole for the Plan Head 3100 and not w.r.t. Individual works.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>SCR to send proposal for consideration at Railway Board.</p>
<p>6.6 SWR NFR</p>	<p><u>Delegation of powers of Re-appropriation of funds across plan-heads:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussions:</p> <p>As per existing directives, for all inter-plan head re-appropriation within Demand No. 16 requires prior approval of Railway Board. These powers may be delegated to General Managers/Zonal Railways to make inter-plan head re-appropriation within the overall allotment of Zonal Railway in the same allocation like DRF, DF etc.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>

<p>6.7 CR</p>	<p><u>Increase the limit for sanction purchase of Furniture:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>PCE/CR mentioned that there is need to increase the limits for sanction of purchase of furniture to at least 10 lakhs per year.</p> <p>It was mentioned that this item pertains to all department, therefore CR may refer it to Railway Board through GM</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Proposal to be sent to Railway Board through GM.</p>
<p>6.8 NFR</p>	<p><u>Executing authority for Pink Book works:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>As per extant instruction of Railway Board, execution of works (other than Track Renewal) costing more than Rs. 3.0 cr. to be carried by Construction Organisation and the works of value less than Rs. 3.0 cr. to be executed by Open Line Organisation. Construction Organisation of NFR is extremely busy in large projects and is often reluctant to do small value works. Considering this, it has been proposed by NFR to Railway Board that this limit should be revised to Rs. 50.0 cr. as the limit of Rs. 3.0 cr. for execution of works by Open Line was fixed in 2006, and is found to be too low.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>6.9 SER</p>	<p><u>Contract Monitoring through IRPSM:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Use of IRPSM for monitoring contracts and preparation of modules for detailed estimate and tender schedule with compatible link with e-tendering (IREPS).</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>IRPSM is presently is utilized primarily for sanction of New works and updating progress of works. It is felt that presently IRPSM platform cannot be effectively utilized for monitoring progress of works especially contracts.</p> <p>The present IRPSM system records progress of work as a whole but often-contradictory progress and TDCs are entered. Monitoring of tenders & contracts is not properly done and it is done manually only on hardcopy files. SER had also made few suggestions.</p> <p>It was opined that SER may send a consolidated proposal regarding changes sought to Railway Board for consideration.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>SER to make reference to Railway Board.</p>

7. Bridges

7.1 **Running of higher axle load:**

NCR

4.5 **Modification in speed certificate issued by RDSO:**

WCR **Issue:**

Phased rebuilding of bridges under restriction on account of limiting tractive effort.

Modification to provision in speed certificates to limit tractive efforts on bridges by limiting switch devices provided in the locos, for BGML, RBG spans of specified lengths.

Discussion:

NCR mentioned that out of total 5,385 nos. of broad gauge bridges approximately 2583 nos. of bridges are of BGML standard & 2,043 nos. of bridges are of RBG standard. Presently CC+8+2 axle load is permitted at 60 km/h on almost all the routes. In double-headed condition locos have been permitted by limiting the tractive effort per loco to 30 T on 165 bridges of BGML & RBG standard. It is practically not possible to implement this condition and monitor the observance of tractive effort limiting device in the field. Present emphasis is on universalization of 25 T axle load running to increase throughput. It is suggested as a policy that bridges requiring restriction of traction effort on identified routes should be rebuilt in a phased manner.

PCE/WCR supplemented that on WCR there are 278 bridges with similar restrictions. The Railway Board's instructions regarding placement of indication boards (TE 30) for drivers is also not practically feasible, nor it is possible to ensure whether traction limiting device is either working or drivers are using it, wherever required or indicated.

In RDSO speed certificates, in many cases, in order to limit tractive efforts on bridges, it is said that drivers will operate limiting switch devices provided in the locos, for BGML, RBG spans of specified lengths. It is very difficult for driver to remember the list of such bridges and also very difficult for the field staff to put the speed restriction / instructions on bridges for observance of these instructions in the fields. Therefore, loco with such stipulations should not be cleared by RDSO otherwise it may lead to serious accidents.

It was also suggested that to solve this issue loco trolls could be tried on IR.

Recommendations:

1. No new loco with the provision of tractive effort limiting switch should be considered for approval.
2. Existing cases of such bridges should be reviewed & strengthening to be proposed by zonal railway.
3. Loco trolls may be tried.

<p>7.2 SCR</p>	<p><u>Planning of important/major bridges:</u></p> <p>Issue & Discussions:</p> <p>Planning/Construction of Important/Major Bridges in Doubling/Tripling projects requires detailed study and proper understanding of river behaviour in the vicinity of the hydraulic structures is extremely important in their planning, design and maintenance part from safety of the structures.</p> <p>SCR emphasised that in Doubling/Tripling projects new bridge should preferably be situated on Downstream side (of existing bridge), especially if the existing bridge has deep foundation so as to minimize additional scour on existing bridge due to eddy formation on account of new bridge being constructed on upstream side. There is a likelihood in case of heavy flooding, eddy formation and scour on the downstream side of new bridge may have some effect on the foundation of the existing bridge. Understanding of the river behaviour upstream and downstream of hydraulic structures helps in their proper planning, design and maintenance.</p> <p>In view of the above, it is suggested that a study may be conducted to study the effect of new bridge on the foundation of the existing old bridge and issue the guidelines for planning of new bridge, adjacent to the existing bridge.</p> <p>It was also mentioned that SCR has already proposed it for consideration by BSC.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>7.3 WCR</p>	<p><u>Design of Bridges with respect to deep screening by BCM.</u></p> <p>Issue & discussions:</p> <p>The design of PSC slab, composite girders and U-type girders issued by RDSO is not suitable for deep screening using BCM. This needs to be elaborated as it may lead to problems in future.</p> <p>ED/CE(P) mentioned that this issue has already been discussed in TSC and certain recommendations have been made on which bridge directorate of RDSO had some reservations. ED/B&S mentioned that the issues flagged by bridge directorate of RDSO need to be reviewed considering the genuine difficulties faced in field.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>RDSO to review designs of PSC slab, composite girders and U-type girders, considering the recommendations made by TSC.</p>
<p>7.4 SWR</p>	<p><u>Side foot path for PSC Slab of 12.2 m:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Provision of side walk-way on PSC bridges.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>The side footpaths for steel girder bridges are being provided in this railway for long/multiple span bridges for the safety of maintenance staff. The PSC Girders are also having provision of side pathway over deck slab. However, a large number of new PSC slab bridges of 12.20 m multiple spans are being constructed by Construction Wing/RVNL under GC, doubling and new lines. PSC slab bridges especially of 12.20 m as per RDSO drawing No. B 10271 does not have the</p>

	<p>provision of side footpath. Therefore, there should be provision in the RDSO standard drawing of 12.2 m PSC slab bridges to cater for safety of P-Way and Bridge Staff over such multiple span Bridges.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>RDSO to review existing drawings and revise as required.</p>
<p>7.5 NFR</p>	<p><u>Provision of Inspection ladder in bridges:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussions:</p> <p>No standard drawing for inspection ladders is available at present for inspection of bearings. As a result, mostly it is left to the field executives of construction organization who are deciding this small but yet vital item of inspection arrangement. The risk is manifold especially in tall bridges where officials had to get down for inspection of Bearings. Therefore, it is imperative that a standard drawing should be issued by RDSO for inspection ladder.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>7.6 WCR</p>	<p><u>Design of ROB:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussions:</p> <p>PCE/WCR mentioned that in design of ROB loading condition as per AMENDMENT NO. 1/IRC:6-2014/JANUARY2014 clause 204.5 Special Vehicle (SV) IRC Class SV Loading: Special Multi Axle Hydraulic Trailer Vehicle should also be adopted. The existing bridge designs should also be checked and validated for new loading standards.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>RDSO is already designing girder for ROB with new loading. However the old designs should also be checked for new loading standard.</p>
<p>7.7 WCR</p>	<p><u>Modification in design of FOB issued by RDSO:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussions:</p> <p>PCE/WCR mentioned that RDSO has developed the FOB drawings as a plate girder type, which is not economical. The deck slab of the FOB is cast in situ therefore it is suggested to design FOB as a composite girder by providing shear connector, it will be reduce the depth of girder and overall cost. For FOBs, standard Drawing with N-type truss may also be issued. This will economical as compare to I-sections. PCE/SR mentioned that a design has already been developed in SR and used in some of the FOBs.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>SR shall send design to RDSO for check and issue of standard drawing.</p>
<p>7.8 SR</p>	<p><u>Revision in IRSOD - Locations having FOB on PFs between two tracks with one side fencing.</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Revision of IRSOD provisions regarding minimum horizontal distance to any building or longitudinal boundary fence from centre line of track on island platform</p>

	<p>serving one side as most of the existing island platforms, serving one side, are narrow and hence the SOD provision of 6.83 m restricts locating FOB landing/subway on such platforms.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SR mentioned that as per ACS No. 11 to IRSOD 2004, the minimum horizontal distance of any building or longitudinal boundary fence from centre line of track is given as 6.83 m under item 7 (b) (i). In case of a passenger platform which happens to be an island platform but fenced on one side (thereby only one side of platform dealing with trains), this stipulation needs to be revised as the real intent of the stipulation is to provide adequate space at the main platform generally catering to the station entrance for various purposes such as stalls, movement of railway staff, deal with main entrance rush, etc.</p> <p>However, in case of island platforms serving one side, this stipulation does not arise and fencing provided on the non-platform side, the stipulated horizontal distance of 6.83 m needs revision and reduction, as most of the existing island platforms, serving one side, are narrow in width and hence the SOD provision of 6.83 m come in the way of locating FOB landing/subway on such platforms. It was suggested that for island platforms which serve only one side, with other side fenced, provision/clause of para 7(a)(ii) under Chapter II – Station Yards of IRSOD (ACS No. 11) for island platforms should be applicable. As the IRSOD is silent about this issue, it is suggested to either incorporate the same in IRSOD or clarify by Railway Board. This will result in avoiding large number of CRS sanction cases being processed for condonation of such infringements.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>SR to make detailed reference to Railway Board.</p>
<p>7.9 SER</p>	<p><u>Guide lines for approval of launching schemes in connection with launching of girders for ROB/Flyover bridges, constructed by Construction Organization:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Issue of guidelines for the approval of the launching schemes in connection with launching of girders for ROBs and Flyovers over running tracks constructed by the Construction Organization.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SER mentioned that Railway Board’s guidelines indicate that in case of Doubling/Gauge Conversion, the General Arrangement Drawings for all the Major Bridges as well as for the bridges where linear waterways is being reduced or the vertical clearances are inadequate besides problem bridges should be approved by CBE on behalf of CE (Open line). However, the Construction Department will be responsible for the design of the structures and its safety. But, no guidelines are available for the approval of the launching schemes in connection with launching of girders for ROBs and Flyovers over running tracks constructed by the Construction Organization.</p> <p>The issue was discussed in detail and the forum opined that this being only a design issue, the launching scheme be also approved by construction Department like other design instead of open line.</p>

	<p>Recommendations:</p> <p>The launching scheme of girders for ROB's and Flyovers over running tracks constructed, by the Construction Organization, to be approved by Construction Organization.</p>
<p>7.10 NWR</p>	<p><u>Dispensing with CRS sanction for launching of FOB and foundation work of ROB:</u></p> <p>Issue and discussions:</p> <p>PCE/NWR brought out that in one of the case, for sanction, CRS made observations as to how the work of foundation and Sub-structure started could be carried out without CRS sanction. It is necessary to start the foundation and Sub structure work in advance, which are not affecting the safety of track for timely completion of GC/Doubling project. The FOB being a light structure and launching is to be done in complete traffic block, so there appears to be no need of CRS sanction for such works. So it is further suggested that sanction of CRS may be dispensed with for launching of FOB and foundation work of ROB and FOB.</p> <p>There was detailed discussions took place duly considering provisions of various act, codes, manuals and instructions in vogue as well as implications of changes being sought. It was concluded that the present instructions are adequate and no modifications are necessary.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>7.11 WCR</p>	<p><u>Fixing of OHE in tunnels:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>PCE/WCR raised an issue that for the fixing of OHE & other structures, in tunnels, a separate structure shall be designed so that existing tunnels do not carry any additional load. Since these old tunnels are in porous/fractured stratum and having lot of seepage and falling of loose materials, their behaviour under additional load could become further un-predictable. He also mentioned that WCR has already referred this issue to RDSO along with a suggested scheme.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>The issue has been already referred to RDSO by WCR. The RDSO to expedite the proposal sent by WCR.</p>
<p>7.12 NER</p>	<p><u>Sleeper Spacing on Bridge Girders:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Alteration in sleeper spacing on girder bridges, to consider the width of channel sleeper.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE NER mentioned that as per para 4.0 of A&C slip No. 128 IRPWM, maximum sleeper spacing on girder bridges should be 600 mm centre to centre and clear distance between two sleepers should not be more than 450 mm. In this context, it is to mention that the width of channel sleeper is 230 mm, therefore, keeping 450 mm clear gap between sleepers, the centre to centre spacing comes out 680 mm. it was also mentioned that the width of top flange of cross girders in various drawings, for 25T open web girder spans, issued by RDSO ranges from 400 to 500</p>

	<p>mm. With width of steel channel sleepers being 230 mm, total centre to centre distance of sleepers adjacent to cross girders will be minimum 640 mm, 730 mm, 680 mm and 630 mm respectively which are higher than maximum centre to centre spacing between sleepers provided as 600 mm in IRPWM, therefore calling for suitable changes in the provision.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>RDSO to issue suitable guidelines, when clear sleeper spacing is more than 450 mm. Regarding spacing of channel sleeper on bridges, it needs to be reviewed on lower side.</p>
<p>7.13 NCR</p>	<p><u>Need to develop more effective design of creep anchors for Steel channel sleepers by RDSO instead of Fair 'V' type creep anchors:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Development of more effective design of creep anchors for steel channel sleepers instead of Fair 'V' type creep anchors.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>NCR brought out that there is problem of excess creep in rails leading to frequent pulling back of rails for adjustment of gap at SEJs provided on alternate piers at Br. No. 30 (14*61m + 2*12m = 16 spans) on river Yamuna between Naini-Allahabad. On this bridge there is a typical bearing arrangement i.e. Roller-Roller on one pier and Rocker-Rocker on the next pier with provision of SEJs at alternate piers and Fair 'V' type creep anchors provided in the centre of welded rails near Rocker ends. But, these anchors are not found effective in arresting creep in rails.</p> <p>Thus, there appears to be a need to develop more effective design of creep anchors by RDSO for use with Steel channel sleepers on such bridges to arrest creep.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>RDSO to examine and propose suitable solution.</p>
<p>7.14 SR</p>	<p><u>Delegation of powers to procure structural steel for fabrication of girders:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Delegation of powers, to CE/TP or CE/WS of zonal railway, to procure structural steel for fabrication of girders for timely procurement.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SR mentioned that at present, the materials required for the fabrication of bridge girders are being procured through Stores Department by placing requisite indents. Very often, the entire quantity of material is not received in one go due to various procedures involved in the tendering process. With the result, though about 80 to 90% of the required steel is received by Workshop, the girders are not getting fabricated fully.</p> <p>Hence it is desirable to delegate the powers to procure the structural steel required for manufacturing of the steel girders by either CE/TP or CE/WS of the Zonal Railway.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>

<p>7.15 SCR</p>	<p><u>Nomenclature of span arrangement for the bridges:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Standardization of nomenclature of span arrangement for the bridges.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SCR mentioned that bridges are historically expressed in terms of clear span giving importance to linear water way. In recent times due to the adoption of PSC girder, RCC pier column etc., majority of times the span is getting reduced or increased and measurement of span is non uniform. For example while construction of a bridge of 5 x 18.30 m RDSO standard, span was indicated as 1 x 17.50 m + 3 x 18.30 m + 1 x 17.50 m. This may lead to a wrong understanding to the field officials as the above bridge is giving an indication as if it is a combination of standard and Non-Standard spans/girders. This may also lead to confusion in case of RH girders are required to be provided on such type of bridges, in case of exigencies. Construction organisation is planning and constructing many of the bridges in their projects using RDSO standard spans. But, it is observed that the nomenclature wise it gives the impression of adopting as Non-standard spans even though where the standard spans are used, maintaining the overall length as same. It is suggested that Nomenclature should be continued as per standard practice at RDSO clear span (mentioning the overall length of the girders or centre to centre span distance etc.), duly mentioning available field clear span in bracket viz., Presently written as, 2x17.50m + 3x18.30m, to be modified as 5x18.3m standard span (Clear span) (2x17.50m - abutment to pier + 3 x 18.30 m - pier to pier)</p> <p>As all Railway works are essentially standardized, especially bridges as it will facilitate in quick restoration in the event of wash-out on account of floods etc., and sometimes during accidents. This will also facilitate in quick analysis of bridges as and when “the Introduction of higher axle loads or increase of speeds” on the existing tracks.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>7.16 WR</p>	<p><u>Exclusion of Pipe Bridges of diameter 600 mm and less (Single pipes) from bridge list.</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Exclusion of small irrigation pipe bridges, of 600 mm dia or less, from bridges list.</p> <p>Discussions:</p> <p>WR mentioned that there are approximately 766 pipe bridges mostly having single pipes of diameter 600 mm and less in WR. These pipes appear to have been provided mainly for irrigation purpose at the time of construction of the railway lines. As per para 2.15 of “Code of practice for the design of substructure and foundation of bridges”, any opening across the track formation for discharge of water, vehicle, men or similar purpose should be considered as bridge. It has been mentioned in the IRBM (vide Advance correction slip No. 25) that the minimum clear span of 1 m should be provided in new bridges and during rebuilding bridges on existing lines minimum headroom of 1.2 m should be provided for proper maintenance of these bridges. Since a large number of such existing pipes of</p>

	<p>diameter less than 600 mm is to be extended/rebuilt for gauge conversion/doubling works. Most of these pipes might have been provided for enabling irrigation of fields on either side. The extension and rebuilding of these old pipes with larger diameter pipes or Boxes having 1 m width and 1.2 m headroom can't be considered rational. Hence, considering these pipes as irrigation drains (instead of bridges) these can be simply extended/rebuilt using pipes of same diameter (or equivalent diameter) as existing, during GC works or doubling. Therefore these small irrigation pipe drains should not be counted as bridges and these drains shall be entered in a separate register for maintenance purpose. Necessary correction in para 2.15 of "<i>Code of practice for the design of substructure and foundation of bridges</i>" be also done.</p> <p>The issue was discussed threadbare and the forum opined that the issue needs to be examine.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>RDSO to examine the issue and make suitable recommendations for consideration of Railway Board.</p>
<p>7.17 WR</p>	<p><u>Carrier Pipe passing through RCC Box (as casing) below the track:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Stipulation of minimum clearance between the carrier pipe and side walls of RCC Box as well as the top slab, in case of carrier pipe passing through RCC box (as casing) below the track.</p> <p>Discussions:</p> <p>WR mentioned that guidelines were issued by for pipeline crossings under railway track for conveyance of water, sewage, petroleum products etc. As per these guidelines suitably designed RCC box is required to be used as casing for carrier pipes intended for the conveyance of water, sewage, petroleum products etc. in case diameter of carrier pipes exceeds 1700 mm. however in the case of carrier pipe passing through RCC box (as casing) below the track, the minimum clearance between the carrier pipe and side walls of RCC Box as well as the top slab is not mentioned in these guidelines.</p> <p>In order to facilitate future maintenance of the carrier pipe and the repair/rehabilitation of the RCC box itself, a clearance of 1,000 mm from the carrier pipe to the side walls of RCC box is suggested based on minimum opening size prescribed for railway culverts so that a person can inspect and may carry out maintenance /repair of the side walls. Likewise a clearance of 1800 mm from top of carrier pipe to the top slab of RCC box is suggested so that a person can stand on a temporary platform erected and carry-out repair of soffit of top slab of RCC box. WR also mentioned that this issue has already been referred to RDSO.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>RDSO to examine and address the issue raised by WR.</p>

<p>7.18</p> <p>WR</p>	<p><u>Requirement of clearance for PSC / RCC slab bridges:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Application of dispensation clause for the new bridges of the doubling lines and in case of slab bridges the requirement of clearance can be stipulated as zero as there is no likelihood of wash away of the slab type spans.</p> <p>Discussions:</p> <p>WR mentioned that as per codal provisions RCC boxes have been permitted to run full and even with heading up of water above top of the box so far we do not violate condition of minimum free board of 1 m. On the other hand, in case of other bridges like slab bridges, girder bridges etc., minimum clearance of 600 mm has been stipulated keeping in mind that floating objects should not hit the super structure and in case of slight flooding more than HFL also should not cause wash away of the super structure.</p> <p>Wherever it is difficult to maintain the minimum clearance in case of rebuilding on existing lines and in gauge conversion projects dispensation clause vide para 4.8.3 of the sub structure code has to be used frequently. However, in case of doubling such dispensation clause is not available though similar difficulties are being faced for keeping required clearance for the new bridges of the doubling of lines, which also pass through the existing LCs and existing yards and thus having constraint for raising of levels.</p> <p>Therefore, it is necessary that dispensation clause should be made applicable to the new bridges of the doubling lines also and in case of slab bridges the requirement of clearance can be stipulated as zero as slabs are quite heavy structures vis-à-vis steel girders of corresponding spans and there is no likelihood of wash away of the slab type spans. In absence of above suggested dispensation, just in order to comply with the codal provisions, field engineers are opting to construct mostly RCC box type bridges as far as possible, which is not correct and not a good practice as it is difficult to rehabilitate degraded box structures and it is also difficult to strengthen box structures for any kind of future higher loading which in turn will necessitate more rebuilding of such box bridges in future. Therefore dispensation clause should be made applicable to the new bridges of the doubling lines also and in case of slab bridges the requirement of clearance can be stipulated as zero.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>RDSO to examine the issue.</p>
<p>7.19</p> <p>WR</p>	<p><u>Bow String Arch Type standard RDSO spans v/s Through Type spans for ROBs:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Adoption of through type spans instead of bow-string arch type spans.</p> <p>Discussions:</p> <p>WR brought out that RDSO has standardised bow-string arch type steel girder spans for ROBs for spans ranging from 30 m to 72 m. On comparison of bow-string arch type girder with Steel composite type girder, there is definite economy of material in terms weight of steel. Bowstring arch type spans have a number of</p>

	<p>limitations like these cannot be launched by cantilever launching method, difficulty in providing closely spaced supporting trestles in case of multiple tracks, assembling/erection of bow string span require site welding by SAW, which might not be possible at site without a full fledged workshop at site, in-service replacement of welded members will be tougher as compared to replacement of members of through type girders. Though RDSO has standardised Bow string arch type girder spans, it is to suggest that across Railway tracks, we should go for through type spans instead of Bow string arch spans which would not have these limitations.</p> <p>It was also mentioned that this item is already being deliberated by BSC for making suitable recommendations.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p><u>8. Level Crossings and ROB/RUB/LHS</u></p>	
<p>8.1 SCR</p>	<p><u>Census for the level crossing gates:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>Presently two wheelers are not being counted while taking the traffic census for the LC gates. Hence a suitable weightage may be given for two wheelers for taking the traffic census at the LC gates.</p> <p>ED/CE(P) mentioned that this issue is already taken up for discussions in TSC.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>8.2 NWR</p>	<p><u>Joint Census of Level crossings:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Outsourcing census at level crossing gate through continuous video recording by providing video cameras at LCs and counting thereafter.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/NWR elaborated that as per IRPWM, Census of Traffic at all level crossings, is to be taken once every three years. The census is carried out by a multi disciplinary inspectorial team consisting of representatives of CE, S&I and Traffic Departments for a period of 7 days (Day & Night). It is not practical and possible to depute team of 3 departments continuously for 7 days & 7 nights. On NWR if this census is to be done on all the level crossings it would require 14,700 man-days of supervisor for each department. (Approximately 75 full time supervisor only for this job).</p> <p>It was suggested that census at level crossing gate may be carried out by outsourcing through continuous video recording by providing video cameras at LCs and counting thereafter. If required, this may be further analysed by multi inspectorial team as sample check.</p> <p>The forum opined and recommended that it is a better system for conducting census, since records would also remain available for verification at a later date.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Census at level crossing gate may be carried out by continuous video recording and counting thereafter.</p>

<p>8.3 NWR</p>	<p><u>Normal position of manned LCs:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Normal position of all manned LCs should be open to road traffic and no train movement be allowed without exchange of private number.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/NWR mentioned that as per Railway Boards instructions regarding Normal position of LC gate the decision about changing the normal position of manned Level Crossing gate (Non interlocked) from 'closed to Road traffic' to 'open to Road traffic' can be taken by DRM with the approval of PCE & COM after fulfilling certain conditions.</p> <p>As per railway Board's guidelines a system need to be evolved for those manned non-interlocked LC gate which are normally kept closed to Road traffic, so that road traffic can be allowed to pass around every 20 minutes by opening of the gates. Once the LC is opened around every 20 minutes the road traffic will not be able to build-up to an unmanageable level. This will require opening of get for minimum 72 times in 24 Hrs. & exchange of private no. for over 144 times. As SMs have tendency to avoid response to gate keeper & therefore tendency of gateman is to succumb to the pressure of road user for opening of gates without exchange of private numbers with SMs & therefore causing unsafe conditions.</p> <p>Since most of the accidents on manned LCs gate having normal aspect 'closed to Road Traffic' have taken place due to opening of gates by gateman without exchange of private no. with Station Master, hence, non interlocked manned LC gates having normal aspect 'closed to Road traffic' continue to be major safety concern as far as accident of manned LC gate are concerned</p> <p>It was suggested that all manned level crossing be allowed with normal position "open to road traffic", which further enhances safety as no train movement would be allowed without exchange of private number by SM & Gate man.</p> <p>It was also mentioned that this issue is already decided by TSC and necessary correction to IRPWM is being processed at Railway Board.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>8.4 NER</p>	<p><u>Review of Whistle Board:</u></p> <p>Issue & Discussion:</p> <p>W/L Board & repeater W/L Board are to be provided at all level crossings and their number is very large in Railway system. At present, two boards on same rail post on pretext of Bilingual Board are being provided (in Hindi as सी/फा and in English as W/L). However, a signage board, only one board with clear signage for long whistle could serve the purpose. It will result in large saving in terms of money as well as maintenance efforts.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>

<p>8.5 WCR</p>	<p><u>Replacement of LC gates by ROB in place of LHS:</u></p>
<p>8.6 SECR</p>	<p><u>Drainage problems in RUBs:</u></p> <p>Issues:</p> <p>Replacement of LC gates will have by construction of ROB at Railway Cost instead of cost sharing, if LC are to be eliminated from the systems.</p> <p>The responsibility of maintenance of road passing through subway, lighting, drainage system, diversion road and any other allied work to rest with state govt.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/WCR mentioned that for replacement of LC with ROB on cost sharing basis, TUV has to be more than 1 lakhs or LC to fall in busy yard where opening and closure of gate is required for more than 12 occasions. (IRPWM Para 925(2)). Other level crossing gates can be replaced by LHS Where sufficient embankment height is there and there is no drainage problem.</p> <p>There are majority of LC gates which are situated on level grounds, therefore, construction of full height of RUB is not feasible and not desirable as heavy traffic cannot be detained during monsoon seasons on account of drainage problem. Therefore these LC gates will have to be replaced by ROB. For which policies direction will have to be changed for construction of ROB at Railway Cost instead of cost sharing, if LC are to be eliminated from the systems.</p> <p>ED/CE(B&S), mentioned that cost sharing provisions already exist in engineering code. He also concluded that subway should be provided, wherever technically feasible, otherwise ROB should be provided as per extent instructions.</p> <p>PCE/SECR stated that Railway Board's guidelines Level Crossings, which do not qualify for sanction of RUB on cost sharing basis, should be planned for elimination by Subways at Railway's cost. It has also been stipulated that the responsibility for the maintenance of the road passing through the subway, lighting, drainage system, and any other allied works will rest on State Govt. On request from Railway, only Govt. of Chhattisgarh have issued instructions that too only to Municipal Corporations which covers only a few subways for arranging maintenance of road passing through the subway, lighting arrangement, drainage etc. But no direction has been issued by Govt. of Maharashtra, Odisha, & Madhya Pradesh. This is resulting into serious drainage problems in RUBs and complaint from public during rainy season.</p> <p>It is suggested that RUB should be constructed only where natural drainage is possible. At other locations, ROB/LROBs should only be planned.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Subway/RUBs should be provided, wherever technically feasible, otherwise ROB should be provided as per extent instructions</p>

9. Land Licensing, Passenger Amenities and Works

9.1 SCR	<p><u>Policy on land licensing for concrete sleeper factories:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Levying nominal rent on the land licensed to PSC sleeper plants.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SCR mentioned that Railway Board policy guidelines vide circular No. 88/W2/LM/18/87 dtd. 29-8-95 regarding licensing of Railway land for setting up of concrete sleeper factories are to be followed. This circular dtd. 29-8-95 has since been superseded with Board's Master circular No.2005/LML/18/8 dtd. 10-02-2005. It has been stipulated that for working out the license fee for land given for sleeper manufacturing firms, category of para 3.1 (a) meant for Railway related activities will be applicable along with other provisions mentioned in Board's circular supra.</p> <p>For those cases, where the licensing fee as mutually agreed upon and already being paid is more than the fee as will be worked out based on the above Board's circular dtd. 10-02-2005, for such cases, license fee already being charged should continue to be levied. The issue of continuing the higher license fee gains special importance in view of the Board's recent modification to Board's letter No.2014/LML-II/18/5 dtd. 29-02-2016, whereby the Evaluator's rate is deleted from the Board's Master circular dtd. 10-2-2005. Further, since the land is only used for the manufacture of PSC sleepers to Railways, higher charges of license fee shall reflect in the bids for the sleeper plants.</p> <p>PCE/SCE suggested that Railway Board might consider levying only a nominal rent on the land to be licensed to PSC sleeper plants. However, to prevent misuse of this, Railway Board may fix norms for the area of land to be licensed at the nominal rates based on production capacity and other factors. Any area of additional land can be at market rates on usual terms.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>SCR to send proposal, with concurrence from finance, to Railway Board for consideration.</p>
9.2 SR	<p><u>Eviction of encroachers from safety zone in Chennai area – Policy on resettlement and rehabilitation of the encroachers:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SCR stated that there are about 700 soft encroachments in the safety zones in North Chennai area. As the encroachers are misusing the railway land despite constructing the compound wall and preventing Railways in undertaking regular safety related works resulting in imposition of temporary speed restriction of 20 km/h. Action was taken by Chennai division to evict the encroachers as per PPE Act 1971/2015. However, as per the advice of Chennai City Police, the eviction programme was dropped.</p> <p>Subsequently, as per the directives of National Green Tribunal (South Zone), Chief Secretary to Tamil Nadu State Government held a meeting with GM/Southern Railway and others concerned on 07-10-2016. During the meeting the Secretary,</p>

	<p>Housing & Urban Development stated that the rehabilitation and resettlement policy is formulated by GOI and Railway being the land owning department is bound to undertake resettlement and rehabilitation as per the Government policy in tandem with the State Agencies. Principal Secretary, Government of Tamil Nadu requested Railways to process for the approval of Railway Board with regard to resettlement and rehabilitation of the encroachers on receipt of the proposal from Tamil Nadu Slum Clearance Board. Railway Board is requested to kindly issue directives whether resettlement and rehabilitation of the encroachers is the concern of Railways as per the policy of GOI.</p> <p>The issue raised by SR was discussed threadbare and the forum was of the view that existing instructions/policy are adequate and necessary action to be taken as per existing policy and extent instruction.</p> <p>Discussed and closed.</p>
<p>9.3 SR</p>	<p><u>Commercial exploitation of vacant railway land through RLDA- Issue of OSR:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Transfer of 10% of land as 'Gift deed' in favour of State Government of Tamil Nadu towards open space reservation (OSR) on the sites entrusted for commercial development in the State of Tamil Nadu:</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>9.4 NCR</p>	<p><u>Transfer of license of Railway land to the Power of attorney holders/legal heir:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Delegation of powers to transfer land license to the Power of attorney holders/legal heir in view of large number of pending cases for regularization and to decide on reference date for reckoning time limit.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>NCR brought out that in case where plot holders are running their business on behalf of original licensees on power of attorney, the present plot holders may be asked to apply afresh for allotment of the same in their name. The rate of license fee should be fixed at 20 % of the market value of land as provided in Board's letter subject to realization of all outstanding dues with 7% interest before entering into fresh agreement as a one time exception with the condition that plot/shop should not be transferred or sold on power of attorney to anyone.</p> <p>Railway Board had also stipulated that considering the magnitude of the problem and huge revenue loss to Railway, and decided to permit one time opportunity for change of name of allottee, regardless of whether they are legal heirs or not, of the original allottees subject to certain conditions.</p> <p>Accordingly the plot/shop holders who are running their business of behalf of original licensees on power of attorney can be asked to apply afresh for allotment of the same shop in their name. However, There is no time limit as to since when they are running their business on power of attorney.</p> <p>In this connection following suggestions were made by NCR-</p> <p>(i) Time limit of power of attorney has not been mentioned. Here board's letter</p>

	<p>gives perception that 05 years period of allotment will be considered from fresh agreement with power of attorney holders.</p> <p>If the allottee has expired more than 05 years ago or the agreement has expired more than 05 years ago, then it should be possible to enter into fresh agreement with the present occupant (POA holder or legal heir) from the present date for next 05 years.</p> <p>(ii) Apart from this, Competency of approval for such type of renewal is not clear in the letter of 26.07.2004. Since such cases numbers are more hence these cases should be decided at division level i.e. Sectional Sr. DEN/DEN.</p> <p>PCEs were of the view that powers should remain vested with GM. However for other issues, NCR may make reference to Railway Board.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>NCR to make reference to L&A directorate of Railway Board</p>
<p>9.5 NCR</p>	<p><u>Commercial Plantation of fruit's bearing trees on Railway land through earning contract:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>In railway, along the track vacant land is available for afforestation. In many places afforestation is done by railway but survival of these plants are low due to little care. For afforestation of vacant Railway land, earning contract can be awarded through normal tendering procedure for planting fruit bearing trees and their harvesting for 10-15 year. Agency can be allowed to provide fencing and watering arrangement on Railway land. Fencing will also protect railway land and prevent cattle to come in Railway limit. This way afforestation can be done in a big way, which will give annual earning to Railway.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>9.6 NCR</p>	<p><u>Problems faced in implementation of Grow More Food Scheme:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>To address problems faced in implementation of Grow More Food Scheme.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>NCR brought out that Grow More Food is one of the focus areas this year. In the guide lines on the subject matter, some problems are being faced in implementation of Grow More Food Scheme with regard to large number of small sized plots, assessment of revenue, which depends on large number of natural factors, issues relating to security deposit, payment etc.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>NCR to send proposal to Railway Board.</p>
<p>9.7 SCR</p>	<p><u>Test Check For Sr. DEN/DENs in various works:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SCR requested that the instructions on test check were last advised in the year 2000 and needs to be revised early. It was mentioned that a proposal had been</p>

	<p>sent from zonal railway is in process at Railway Board.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Railway board to expedite.</p>
<p>9.8 SR</p>	<p><u>Standardization of Water Recycling Plants (WRP):</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SCR mentioned that wherever the works are taken up by Engg. Department, they are made of RCC/Masonry structures, whereas, the works taken up by Mech. Department, these structures are made of Over head Steel Structures as part of turnkey project. It is suggested that RDSO may issue Standard Drawings for WRPs of various capacities such as 0.20 MLD, 0.20 to 0.50 MLD, 0.50 to 1.00 MLD and more than 1.00 MLD.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>9.9 CR</p>	<p><u>Provision of passenger amenities on PFs in various projects:</u></p> <p>Issue discussion:</p> <p>All passenger amenities should be provided on the PF's created in various projects including amenities for Ladies and Divyang persons.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.:</p>
<p>9.10 SCR</p>	<p><u>Stations with MEA deficiencies condoned by General Manager:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SCR mentioned that for stations with MEA deficiencies condoned by GM are not being reflected as completed in PAMS module.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>SCR to make reference to Railway Board.</p>
<p>9.11 SCR</p>	<p><u>Area of waiting halls available at a station is to be calculated by adding the areas of general, gents, ladies & upper class waiting halls:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SCR mentioned that in PAMS report, only the area of General Waiting Hall is being considered for calculation of deficiency. Areas of Gents, Ladies & Upper Class Waiting Halls are not being added. As such, though there is no deficiency of waiting halls, deficiency is being shown for some stations. Hence the formula for calculating total waiting hall area may please be corrected.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>9.12 SER</p>	<p><u>Re-development of railway stations- by specialized agency:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Dispensing with Independent Committee of Eminent Experts (ICEE), constituted for examination of all the proposals for re-development of stations.</p>

	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>PCE/SER flagged an issue regarding proposed redevelopment of A-1 & A category railway stations entrusted to zonal railways. For this purpose an Independent Committee of Eminent Experts (ICEE) is to be constituted by Railway Board to examine all the proposals referred to it by Technical & Financial Committees. Recommendation of such committee may be at variance with recommendation of Railways's STC/SFC and duplication of recommendations may create problems for GM. He further suggested that proposed ICEE may be dispensed with in the procedure and instead creation of a separate dedicated unit for station redevelopment. The unit may consist of Engineering, Finance, Commercial & Other department officers of suitable level. Alternatively, it is suggested that selected 28 category stations may be handed over to specialized agency like IRSDC (with deputation of additional officers/staff), which work outside framework of normal Railway working. Further Transaction Advisor is to be appointed by M/s RITES for all zonal Railways (Except NR) as advised by Board on 22.07.16. It may be expedited so that process of finalization of bid/agreement documents is finalized before calling bid.</p> <p>It was opined that the procedure suggested would provide synergy between Railway and IRSDC, who may get all data from zonal railway and finalize the agency. For this a railway may send suggested <i>modus operandi</i> to Railway Board.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>SER to make reference to Railway Board.</p>
<p>9.13 CR</p>	<p><u>Provision of Rain Water Harvesting Plants:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Rain Water Harvesting Plants and Water Recycling Plants to be provided in case of construction of new stations and buildings.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>9.14 CR</p>	<p><u>Provision of bio-toilet for gate lodges at level crossings:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Provision of bio-toilet at gate lodges and level crossings.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>9.15 NER</p>	<p><u>Creation of awareness for ground water regulation, pollution control norms, NGT rulings and water management system:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>PCE/NER felt that officers and staff are not well acquainted with environmental norms in connection with the ground water regulation, pollution control norms, national green tribunal rulings and water management system items. He suggested that a separate programme to be organized at IRICEN/Pune so that the officers & staff may be made aware of above.</p> <p>Upon discussion PCEs were of the view that the Environment directorate of Railway Board may be requested for issue of comprehensive instructions and</p>

	<p>preparation of manual for reference by all concerned.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Environment directorate of Railway Board to prepare and issue comprehensive guidelines/manuals.</p>
<p><u>10. Miscellaneous</u></p>	
<p>10.1</p> <p>CR</p>	<p><u>Hiring of Vehicles for SG/JAG officers in lieu of Transport allowance:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>Permission to hire vehicles for SG/JAG officers working at HQ in lieu of transport allowances. The powers to be delegated to HOD level This will motivate officers to work at HQ.</p> <p>Discussed and dropped.</p>
<p>10.2</p> <p>NWR</p> <p>SECR</p>	<p><u>Hiring of vehicle for Senior Supervisors:</u></p> <p><u>Field Transport Vehicle for SSE/Bridge:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Powers to sanction hiring of vehicle for Senior Supervisors to be given to the concerned Branch Officers/DRM in the Division.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>NWR and SECR raised an issue that in spite of the fact that mobility improves the efficiency, the rules for hiring of inspection vehicles for supervisors are quite stringent. It was mentioned that all categories of Senior Supervisors (In-charge of the section) should be provided hired vehicle for improved mobility specially those who are directly related to safety and maintenance work.</p> <p>They are also required to travel longer distance and at short notice such as SSE/PW/USFD required to go in the mid section for USFD testing along with equipment. There is no suitable means of transportation is presently available and therefore they face a lot of problem in performing their duty. Providing vehicle to them will enhance their performance. Similarly, SSE/work with artisan staff along with material need to go in the section/station to attend repair works. Generally these staff goes at the point of their work by local train and can attend repair only at single location wasting a lot of time in waiting and travel. If vehicle is provided to SSE/Works it would be possible to attend more complaint in limited time. Powers to sanction the hiring of vehicle to Senior Supervisors should be given to the concerned Branch Officers/DRM in the Division.</p> <p>Further push trolleys for SSE/Bridge have been withdrawn and there is no general policy for transport vehicle for SSE/Bridge. Currently, mobility of Bridge units for maintenance and restoration is a big constraint. As such, small capacity road vehicles (Like Tata 207/407) should be provided to each SSE/Bridge Unit. Suitable guide lines needs to be issued in this regard.</p> <p>It was also mentioned that hiring of vehicle for SSE/P.Way has been permitted, therefore on similar lines hiring of vehicles for other supervisors should also be</p>

	<p>allowed, for which powers can be delegated to DRM/SAG officer in charge.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Hiring of vehicles for works/bridge supervisors should also be allowed on similar line as that for SSE/P.Way.</p> <p>The powers to hire vehicles should be delegated to DRM/SAG officers in charge of unit.</p>
<p>10.3</p> <p>CR</p>	<p><u>Delegation of powers to permit Air Travel:</u></p> <p>Issue & discussion:</p> <p>Permission for air travels one side on duty by PCE. At present permission is being granted by General Manager. In limited cases, PHOD should be empowered to permit one side air travel by SAG/SG officers.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Zonal railway may send a proposal with GM's approval to Railway Board.</p>
<p>10.4</p> <p>NFR</p>	<p><u>Mitigation of Elephant Mortality due to Train Hits on N.F. Rly:</u></p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Sharing of cost of construction for construction of Elevated Corridors at identified Elephant corridors for free passage of Elephants.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>NFR mentioned that, for identified Elephant Corridors through which Railway track is passing, permanent speed restrictions have been imposed. And in spite of providing Signage Boards to pre-warn the Train Drivers and conducting sensitizing programmes for Train Drivers, Guards & Station Masters and keeping Rly track free from food waste, for not attracting Elephants, train accidents/Side collisions, with presence of Elephants are often taking place. There is all around pressure from Political, Social & Public front also. It is in the interest of Rly to avoid accidents/side collisions with Elephants, for which Elevated Corridors at identified locations by providing sufficient openings of adequate height for free passage of Elephants have been proposed as none of the other measures tried (such as fencing, barricading, providing smooth surface for crossing the track etc.) are effective. This has also been agreed by Forest Officials in principle. However, for sharing of cost of construction is yet to be agreed upon by State Govt.</p> <p>PCEs were of the view that the matter may be referred to Railway board.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>NFR may refer this issue to Environment directorate Railway Board.</p>
